JUN 2 - 1950

Laky Zsigmond.
Youngstown, O. -

THE APOSTOLIC MESSAGE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/apostolicmessage1925benj

THE APOSTOLIC MESSAGE

A Historical Inquiry

By

BENJAMIN W. BACON

D.D., Litt.D. (Oxon.)

LIBRARY OF

Bonebrake Theological Seminary

232.3

B12 23,492

PUBLISHED BY THE CENTURY CO.

NEW YORK 1925 LONDON

Copyright, 1925, by
THE CENTURY CO.

Printed in U. S. A.

PREFACE

The doctrine of Blood Atonement is no new subject of inquiry. But it is still very much in debate; and reason requires that historical research precede theological restatement. Recently developed methods make the historico-critical line of approach appropriate for our time.

The present volume aims to apply these historico-critical methods. To some extent the inquiry will necessitate revaluation; for no interpretation can be made to appear likely of adoption in the past which violates obvious principles of moral sense. To these the biblical writers were susceptible as well as we. Interpretations of the doctrine which ascribe to them indifference or obtuseness of moral sense are *a priori* improbable. On the other hand, the besetting sin of interpreters not thoroughly grounded in the historico-critical principle of objectivity has always been to argue: This view appears reasonable to me, therefore it must have been that of the inspired writer. The present volume would avoid both extremes. Its author aims at more exact statement of the meaning of the New Testament writers, leaving it to those better qualified than himself to reformulate in terms adapted to modern theology the permanent values of The Apostolic Message.

CONTENTS

PART I

CHAPTER		PAGE
	a. The Problem	1
I	History and Dogma	3
II	Salvation by Grace	36
	b. New Testament Solutions	75
III	The Common Gospel as Interpreted by Paul	77
IV	The Witness of Peter	112
V	The Gift of the Spirit in "James"	148

PART II

	a. In the Time of Jesus	181
VI	The Background of the Record	183
VII	Why Jesus Went to the Cross	210
VIII	The Covenant Supper	245
	b. The Anointed Servant	279
IX	Jesus' Doctrine of the Spirit	281
X	The Primitive Meaning of the Sacraments	314

PART III

	The Gospel for Our Own Time	351
XI	Gospel and Theology	353
XII	The Message in Modern Terms	392

PART I

INTRODUCTORY

a. THE PROBLEM

THE APOSTOLIC MESSAGE

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY AND DOGMA

I.

FROM the time of the Apostle Paul, "the word of the cross" has always been the essential and most effective message of the Christian preacher. It would be a truism of religious history to say that the preaching of the cross made conquest of the world. To unnumbered millions, the crucifix embodies virtually all they know of the Gospel. The sacrifice of the Mass is their whole expression of faith. This is the undoubted fact. But it is not all. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* Representative theologians of our own and former times justify that predominant position which the cross assumes in the symbolism and ritual of the Church.

Protestants use their own forms for expressing belief in the supreme significance to religion of the death and resurrection of Jesus, but as regards the

cardinal importance of the doctrine, they do not differ from Romanists, or Romanists from the Greek Church. A Presbyterian divine of eminence in the generation just passed defines "the catholic faith of Christendom" to be the doctrine "that Christ's death is the ground on which sins are forgiven." [1]

Theologians speak of this as the doctrine of the Atonement, and the logic of the system-maker confirms the experience of the preacher. Whoever will glance at the shelves containing the literature of nineteen centuries interpreting this doctrine, from Origen to Anselm, and from Anselm to the Dean of Carlisle, whoever observes what occupies the central place in the creeds of Christendom, will need no further demonstration that the Atonement has always been the central doctrine of Christianity. For preacher and theologian alike, the theme of the everlasting Gospel of the Son of God is this: "Your sins are forgiven you for His name's sake."

Modern interpretations of the Atonement have become widely diverse. There is no hope of unity in the proclamation of the common message save by differentiation of essentials from non-essentials, to find harmony in the one, liberty in the other. And the essentials are to be found, if at all, in the simplest beginnings. In the present volume we are seeking to

[1] Marcus Dods in *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought* (1900), p. 178.

establish by historical inquiry, how the gospel was originally understood, what it comprised; in other words, what really constituted from the beginning The Apostolic Message. Logically, we should preface our research by some brief review of the Atonement doctrine in its historical development. Otherwise we shall scarcely know of what to take especial note. For differences as well as agreements have existed from the beginning. Indeed, if anything could be more striking than the concentration of the best and keenest thought of the Church upon the forgiveness of sins as the central doctrine of the faith, it would be the inability of theologians to reach a conclusion satisfactory to any age or any authoritative body as to the precise meaning attaching to it. Much as councils have insisted upon the fact of the Atonement, they have never ventured to place their imprimatur on any particular theory of its method. The field, therefore, is confessedly open. Guidance from the promised Spirit of Truth should be welcome. Yet the task of reconstruction of an edifice reared through the ages is no light one. Builders must aspire to furnish a contribution rather than to complete the work. The inquirer should be satisfied if he is able to bring about a better appreciation of the problem—its nature, and the source, or sources, of difficulty.

In the construction of a consistent theory of the Atonement, two difficulties are involved, one not pe-

culiarly Christian, but a consequence of the broader issue of the moral government of God. It is the question of forgiveness in general, a belief which all theistic faiths must maintain against mechanistic or pantheistic systems. Christianity, like the Jewish faith which preceded it, conceives the relation between man and God in terms of personality. Its prayer is, "Forgive us our debts; for we also forgive everyone that is indebted to us." That is the simple assumption. But it requires to be reconciled with another no less imperative, the moral law of retribution "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." Assuming remission of penalty to be an essential factor of forgiveness, can a God whom we assume to be just and wise, as well as good, remit the suffering entailed by sin? And if the suffering be not remitted, wherein does the forgiveness consist?

The second difficulty is more specifically Christian, arising as it does from the special circumstances attending the origin of this religion. Can a good and wise God permit the innocent to suffer on behalf of the guilty? Is vicarious suffering or intercessory mediation compatible with the ideal moral order, and if so, in what sense? Primitive, even pre-Christian, theologians sought to deal with the former difficulty, aiming to reconcile mercy with justice. Primitive Christian apologists were forced to deal with the lat-

ter difficulty in order to show that the sufferings of Christ might be understood as endured on our behalf.

It is not true (and the fact should be admitted in all candor) that the doctrine "that Christ's death is the ground on which sins are forgiven" is presented in *all* authoritative documents of the faith from the beginning as "the catholic faith of Christendom." The writings of Luke, for whatever reason, form a marked and conspicuous exception to nearly all the remainder of the New Testament in this respect. Likewise in the Epistle of James, there is no mention of the cross. Our inquiry must largely concern itself with the reason, or reasons, for these exceptions. Why should Christ's death be never advanced in Luke and Acts as ground for the message of grace, although repentance and forgiveness are more distinctively the theme in these writings than elsewhere, and in these beyond all others we find use (for purposes of apologetic) of the prediction of the Servant of Jehovah, whom Isaiah describes as suffering vicariously for sinners? The exceptions are surprising enough. But considered as such, they only emphasize the rule.

From the very circumstances of its origin, Christianity was compelled to confront in its most poignant form the age-long question of unmerited suffering. It is true that no religion is exempt from this perplexing

necessity. But the cross brought home the challenge with peculiar directness, forcing the believer in Christ to justify his faith in a God whose representative was left to meet this martyr fate. Could this be a God of righteousness? None could accept him as such without an explanation of the cross. It is inconceivable that repentance and forgiveness should have been preached in the name of this Christ "crucified through weakness" without an explanation. In point of fact, the records are explicit and incontrovertible that an explanation *was* offered. From the beginning, the proclaimers of the Gospel fell back upon the Isaian prophecy: "He died according to the Scriptures." This is the constant apologetic of Luke. Only he never adds with other writers: "He died *for our sins*."

The contrast between the apologetic and the evangelic view of the cross appears in its most striking form when the utterances of Luke and Paul are placed side by side. Luke bends every effort to prove that Jesus was the Christ *in spite of* the cross. He is never tired of this theme. Because it was part of the determinate foreknowledge and counsel of God, as proved from the writings of the prophets, the cross should be regarded as a confirmation, not a disproof, of Jesus' claims. To Paul it is *because of* Jesus' obedience "even unto the death of the cross" that God thus highly exalted him. Both recognize that the cross is a stumbling block and rock of offense to

the Jews. Paul glories in it as a proof of God's love. Luke explains it away as a crime which it had been predetermined in the inscrutable providence of God that the Jews should commit.

The word of the cross, therefore, brought with it its own problem, though even in the apostolic age the problem was not new. Already, in Philo, the two supreme attributes of divinity, goodness and sovereignty, are only to be reconciled in the higher unity of the divine wisdom (Λόγος). Paul also meets this inevitable problem for the theologian, the question of Law and Grace: How can a just God be a justifier of the unjust? But Paul's doctrine of Grace did not come first. It was a corollary of the previous contention of the first apologists: "He died for our sins." Even before Paul, the stumbling-block of the cross had evoked this appeal to "the Scriptures," and in return, the question had been raised: Can there be a suffering of the righteous which avails with God for the sinful? Contemporary Jewish theology was not without its answers to this question, both in affirmation and denial, and these we must consider in due course. On the Christian side, Paul was a leader in framing the answer of the Church. But it is already evident that Paul's answer was not the only one of primitive Christianity. Indeed, salvation could not be preached at all, either to Jews or Gentiles, "through the grace of the Lord Jesus," without a

confrontation of this problem in both forms. Answers given in the past may or may not suffice for men of to-day. They certainly will not suffice, they cannot even be understood, without reëxamination.

A survey of treatises on the Atonement, from the church fathers to the present day, fails to indicate satisfactory advance toward a solution. Indeed, a profound dissatisfaction is the prevailing note in a recent composite volume in which seventeen nineteenth-century preachers and theologians express their minds on this subject. Names of greater or less authority can indeed be cited in favor of falling back on the declaration that the nature of the Atonement is an insoluble mystery. Theologians might be excused for such a surrender of the problem because of its admitted complexity. But the historian will find little to support this plea, whether in Scripture or in the example of great Christian thinkers of the past. As McLeod Campbell pointed out:

> The scriptural writers do not hint at a mystery, but write as if every reader would understand them when they speak of Christ being "a propitiation set forth by God that He might justify all who believe in Him"; or of Christ's offering himself to God, and "putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself"; or of God "remembering no more our sins and iniquities." [2]

Dr. T. T. Munger calls the plea of mystery a pious sophistry "which, if you tell it to any man of real

[2] Cited by Dean Fremantle, *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought,* 1900, p. 167.

thought, straightway you make an infidel of him." [3] The difficulty, it would seem, lies not so much in obtaining the sense of Scripture, as in obtaining from Scripture a sense acceptable to modern minds.

However, modern minds are not disposed to cease inquiry. If Principal Forsyth be right,

> We are leaving behind us the hazy idea that we have the fact of the Atonement and that no theory need be sought or can be found. The fact of the Crucifixion does not depend on theory, but a fact like the Atonement can be separated from theory of some kind only by a suffusion of sentiment upon the brain, some ethical anemia, or a scepticism of the spiritual intelligence.[4]

It is one thing to determine by grammar, lexicon, and concordance what particular solution of the problem was adopted by this biblical writer or that, by Paul, or James, or Luke; and quite another thing to solve the problem for our own or future ages. True, there are interpreters who succeed in making the gospel narrative teach the very doctrine most acceptable to our own thought. But success itself of this kind casts suspicion on the result. The very modernity of much "liberal" interpretation proves its own undoing. The biblical writers certainly did *not* think in modern terms. Interpretation should be severely historical. Adaptation and application belong in a different field, and should be employed afterward and avowedly.

Our age is no more exempt than any other from

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 356 f.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

the necessity of explaining both the fact of the cross and the belief in the forgiveness of sins. In other words it must do its own thinking on the Atonement, that cardinal doctrine of Christianity which unites the two. Moreover, our thinking must go to the bottom, both in the field of historical interpretation and in that of modern philosophy. But historical interpretation is not historical if colored by predilections of the interpreter. Neither is modern thought true to itself if controlled by the *arrière-pensée* of conformation to ancient standards. The value of each to the other depends on this mutual independence. Hence we may not view the question as a mere problem of exegesis, falling back on the authority of the past, content to say: "Thus thought the Apostle, therefore I must think the same." Not even regarding the reported utterances of Jesus can we venture to say this; for (granting the accuracy of the report) there are many respects in which we cannot think as the ancients thought, try as we may. When we have done all as faithful interpreters, we shall be most conscious of difference. And this very difference will prove the value of our work. For of all teachers of the world, none would be more forward than Jesus and Paul to bid us rouse our minds from servile dependence, and make our thinking indeed like theirs by being more than a mere reproduction. Real thought will be creative, individual. Jesus and Paul

do not ask the worthless tribute of servile conformation, else they would have committed to their disciples doctrinal standards in written form. They ask the corroboration of that echo which uttered truth calls forth in kindred souls, the corroboration which flows from making their thoughts our own by restatement in modern terms. So of the Church also. It wisely declines to formulate an authoritative theory of the Atonement, proclaiming only its belief in the forgiveness of sins "through the grace of the Lord Jesus."

II.

The principle just laid down involves two precautions in any attempt to restate the Apostolic Message: (1) The problem cannot be solved by placing our own conception first and then interpreting Scripture with the tacit intention of reaching a corresponding result. We have no right to say: "The Atonement means so and so to me; therefore such must have been its meaning from the first." With such an approach, the bending of Scripture is almost foredoomed. More real disloyalty is shown in such a course than in frank confession: "Such and such appears to have been the idea as shaped in the mind of Jesus or of Paul, but it fails to commend itself fully to my mind. I feel compelled to adopt another view." (2) Con-

versely, we do despite to the God-given Spirit of truth within when we abdicate the judgment-seat of reason, giving a verdict against the evidence because overawed by past authority. As Bishop Butler says, "Reason is the only faculty we have whereby to judge of anything, were it revelation itself." The bending of our own sense of truth is no less fatal than the bending of Scripture. Only in mutual independence of minds can there be real corroboration.

Just appreciation of duty on both sides bids us, then, first define the thought of the great teachers of antiquity in its unalloyed purity. Afterward, should the doctrine thus defined meet the logic of modern minds without change or modification, well and good. If not, the Christian's teachers are not of those who call for an *immolatio rationis*, or feel honored by a disciple's intellectual suicide, as Abraham once sought to honor God by slaughter of his first-born. The "spiritual worship" which our faith requires is a consecration of the intellectual powers (as of all others) to the service of God in their fullest and highest development. Loyalty to those who transmit to us their faith will seek and attain a higher unity in all matters of difference. It will be found in deeper-lying principles accepted in past and present alike.

Our problem involves, then, reciprocal independence; exegesis without modernization, reconstruction

without servile conformation. In interpretation we must be as old-school as the ancients themselves. In application we must be modernists indeed. Given certain dealings of God's providence, we must first understand clearly what they have been taken in the past to mean. Next, if worthy to take our place with men who like Job have refused to be satisfied with conventional solutions, we shall confront theory with fact, setting over against the deductions of men of old-time, inductions from historic reality as seen under our own wider horizon. We must endeavor to face the drama of history with as broad vision as Paul, when he sets forth to the Romans his conception of divine providence as manifested in the vicissitudes of the race, Jewish and Gentile. We must face it as Anselm did when he put the question: What was, and is, the purpose of God? *Cur Deus Homo?* Surely it is no unworthy occupation for the philosophic mind to ask whether human history presents an intelligible meaning. Surely that series of events which culminates in Calvary may not be excepted from the search. Let us face it, then, and, ask What was that meaning? Paul thinks that in some way "God" entered into the tide of human affairs. If this be true in any sense, then surely "God" entered it in that event which has more deeply affected human affairs than any other of which we have record. Is there a meaning in the tragedy of Calvary? Why

was it? To what end this tragic outpouring of divinest spiritual life? Great minds have grappled with this problem in the past. Our own time demands that it be faced anew.

III.

We have noted that it is possible to evade the demand for a theory of divine government by taking refuge in the plea of mystery. It is also possible to present Christianity as a mere teaching of theistic ethics resting on the authority of Jesus, whose nobility of character commends itself to our moral sense and thus elicits imitation. On this plan no specifically Christian theology is required. That presupposed by Jesus, the theology of the Synagogue, will suffice. One need only follow his example, without reference to its harmony or disharmony with experience, whether individual or racial. Paul's theologizing may be disregarded. This method throws all responsibility for thought on the chosen Leader, and to some may appear an advantage. But we have little sympathy with the current disposition to decry theology. The opposite should be our attitude. If there is ground for a disposition of this kind, it can only be because theologians have taken too restricted a view of their task, or lacked courage in facing it. Certainly, a truly scientific and logical account of the

religious instinct in its historical development would not be unacceptable to the modern world. A modern Paul would not be amiss.

Theology may be defined as the history, interpretation, and valuation of the idea of God. If the idea itself is obsolete, the task of the theologian is brief. Once the record has been concluded, the subject may be dismissed. But genuine students of anthropology and sociology will hardly maintain that the idea *is* obsolete. If not, we are confronted with the question of its significance and validity. We advance from the psychology to the philosophy of religion. A theistic interpretation of the world assumes as its working hypothesis personality (whatever sense be given to the word) in man and God. It acknowledges a limited, provisional anthropomorphism. It makes "man the measure of all things," in the sense that what is "highest" in man supplies a proper analogy on which to frame a conception of God. Verification will then depend on human experience. The facts of history (so far as available) will tend to modify, prove, or disprove the hypothesis. Theology must especially consider those events which have chiefly affected human progress on the moral and social side; and among these, Calvary cannot be denied an important, if not the principal, part.

Whether Christianity as a world religion can safely rest upon the authority of Jesus' teaching, (mediated

by the critic), or demands in addition a theology, is a question to which we shall recur. In the meantime, we may posit the latter view, which involves a doctrine of the cross. This need not necessarily be Pauline. Theology may adopt some other symbol than the cross (if available) of equal significance. But it cannot close its eyes to the primal and classic attempt of Paul to solve the problem of vicarious suffering by it.

One of the outstanding phenomena in the religious thinking of to-day is the revolt already described against conventional statements of the Pauline doctrine, and this revolt has been followed in turn by an intense reaction. Hence the demand for restatement. In the volume already quoted, supposedly representative teachers of various evangelical churches present their personal convictions. There is a remarkable degree of unanimity. But it is not a unanimity of agreement with traditional views. Neither is it a coincident new interpretation of biblical doctrine. Indeed the purpose of the volume seems almost to exclude historical interpretation. It is a unanimity of protest. The writers revolt against current ideas. But they fail to discriminate exegesis from constructive theology. They scarcely attempt to say what was the doctrine of this scriptural writer or that. They aim to tell the views reached by themselves in their own thinking on the problem of for-

giveness and the fact of the cross. Each seems bent on defining "What Christianity Means to Me." So far as any attempt is made to define the New Testament views, it seems to be taken for granted by the writer in each case that what Christianity means to him it must have meant to any truly inspired writer. Biblical theology as a historical discipline is scarcely recognized. Thus the aim seems to be practical rather than historical. But there is no mistaking the protest against current ideas inherited from theologians of the medieval and post-Reformation periods. As to this, all are vigorous "protestants." And the protest has a deep foundation. It is based on present-day conceptions of the moral nature of God. As one contributor (Dr. Lyman Abbott) expresses it:

> Two things are for us incredible, (1) that God should forgive the impenitent; (2) that He should not forgive the penitent.

Few will deny to modern theologians the right, and even the duty, to resist the imposition of any doctrine in conflict with these clear principles of our common theistic faith. Nor will it be denied that views have been current which did entail such conflict. Oftentimes they have claimed an unwarranted authority. They have been asserted in a spirit of intolerance as foreign to the Gospel as baseless in the history of the universal Church. Arrogant intolerance invites revolt. The form it assumed in the present case

appears clearly in the volume before us. Its readers will probably be convinced of at least two things: (1) That conventional doctrines of the Atonement have great need of restatement before they can be made acceptable to the religious consciousness of to-day. (2) That this new religious consciousness rests on no less solid foundation than a truer and worthier apprehension of the character and disposition of God. On the other hand, there can, of course, be no lasting reconstruction which disregards the past, or rejects its valid conclusions. The deepest of all streams of religious progress is that of worthier apprehension of the nature of God, and as regards progress along this line, there can be no clearer or more convincing witness than that of the Bible itself. From feudal to post-Reformation times and down to the present day, it has known no cessation. Whatever the eddies and side-currents, men have continued, and will continue, to think more and more worthily of God. Even our own age, with all its sense of ill desert, is conscious that its conception of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is truer and nobler than the conceptions current in former ages of the Church. If views once held of the Atonement are now "incredible" on this account, if they violate the Christian consciousness of to-day as "immoral," the protest cannot be lightly suppressed. It is time for restatement in terms which

our Christian conscience can approve. Let us note the nature of the protest.

Whether the volume cited be truly representative or not, no honest and impartial survey of modern views of the Atonement can fail to reveal a difference from those of former times, and in just those elements of religious thought which are most fundamental and vital. Within the last few centuries, perhaps even the last few generations, Christian conviction has undergone a change. The language by which Luther expressed God's attitude toward sinful men, or Edwards in the famous Enfield Sermon, is to-day rather revolting than persuasive. It may be charitably presumed, and doubtless should be, that expressions such as "fury" and "loathing" to express the divine displeasure were not intended even by Luther and Edwards to be taken in a strictly literal sense. They themselves were more or less consciously anthropomorphic and figurative in their use of terms. But the very fact that to-day such terms could not be used with approval on the part of the devout, or with effect upon the undevout, is proof of change in Christian conviction as regards the deepest of all elements of religious faith, the mind, or character, or disposition of God.

And it is inconceivable that the Christian consciousness should ever reverse itself with reference to this

change. We of to-day clearly recognize it to be in accordance with the true mind of Christ. The advance is not a mere matter of words, but accords with his assurance of an abiding Spirit of Truth, recalling and reinterpreting his words, leading men on in later generations to larger and larger apprehension of their latent content. Moreover, the change also represents a stride onward along that slowly mounting path by which humanity has made its way upward, in the long history of religious progress, from conceptions of God which were more crudely anthropomorphic toward such as depicted Him in accordance with what is highest in man. The God that is reverenced by Christendom to-day is a more Christ-like God than the Being who was reverenced centuries ago. The step forward will never be reversed.

IV.

The modern view presents the claim, as against earlier theories of the Atonement, that it is more "moral." More than half a century ago Horace Bushnell could write at the beginning of his book entitled *The Vicarious Sacrifice Grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation:*

> No doctrine of Christ's work has been developed that can be said to have received the general consent of the Christian world. But there has been a perceptible tendency toward the moral view of it.

We must, of course, recognize that the term "moral" is here used in a special and technical sense. But in every sense fifty years have more than justified this claim. Nearly all the representatives of "Modern Religious Thought" present a view of the Atonement which is of this type. Every expiation doctrine is rejected on all sides as "pagan." All forms of pre-Anselmic ransom-doctrine are treated as archaic. All legal fictions of imputed guilt or righteousness are rejected as violations of our sense of right. One evangelical teacher and preacher here vies with another in denouncing the one-time favorite theories of "satisfaction," "substitution," and "propitiation." Several deplore even the survival of the terms. They should be used, we are told, only as modernizing interpretations may "give us the deeper spiritual meaning contained in the phrases which tell us that (Jesus) 'bore our sins in his own body on the tree'; that 'he suffered the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,'"[5] and the like. Perhaps the general effect of the joint expression is not exaggerated by Principal James Drummond, who states it as follows in his *Studies in Christian Doctrine* (1908), p. 346:

> While an attempt is made by a few of the writers to maintain a rather obscure doctrine of substitution, and even the penal character of Christ's death, and most are eager to

[5] Washington Gladden, *ibid.*, p. 232.

declare their belief in the Atonement, the series as a whole is remarkable for its rejection, I might say its scornful rejection, of the authorized doctrine. We are told that the doctrine, or some part of it, is "crude," "puerile or immoral" (Dean Fremantle), "fatuous and devilish" (Dr. Marcus Dods), "satisfactory to the superstitious piety and the inferior morality of the Middle Ages," and "absolutely contrary to the fundamental postulates of Scripture, as well as to those of the Christian conscience" (Professor Sabatier); from which we may see that the "ghastliness of this appalling doctrine" (Rev. B. J. Snell) is condemned in no measured terms by men whom one would expect to be its supporters.

Even with some discount from this characterization of the book, it will be apparent from the extracts Drummond has made that the evangelical leaders here represented felt no small dissatisfaction with what he designates the "authorized" doctrine of their time, meaning, no doubt, the Atonement doctrine as commonly preached and sometimes officially defined. Intelligent Christians knew a generation ago that Origen's theory of a ransom paid to Satan, Anselm's of a satisfaction of the offended rights of God, Grotius' of a vindication of the abstract majesty of law, were all prolonging only a galvanized, factitious life.

With the abandonment of the old demonology, the decay of feudalism, the reluctance to admit the abstract claims of law as such, the feeling that religion must be regarded spiritually and not as a business affair, every one of these theories is swept away and cast into the limbo of dead beliefs.[6]

[6] Principal Adeney, op. cit., p. 152.

Their complaint was that without authorization

The most crude conceptions of the Atonement still linger on and assert themselves with considerable vehemence in circles of life that are untouched by movements of thought. They still dominate an eager elementary evangelism.

We must expect this domination from "the limbo of dead beliefs" to continue until such spiritual values as are still obtainable from the conventional conceptions are made accessible in more reasonable form. But the terms which modern preachers still borrow from obsolete systems are not the expressions of a spontaneous and living faith. The modern evangelical, if freely expressing his own belief, would not choose the language of Luther: "God's anger against the sinner was so fierce that He could be appeased only by the blood of His Son." It is not as the congenial expression of his personal faith, but either unthinkingly, or under a certain constraint, that the modern churchman falls into the less shocking language of Article II of the Church of England: "Christ was crucified to reconcile his Father to us and to be a sacrifice." These terms were not even the free coinage of the minds of Luther and the Anglican divines. As in other, more modern attempts to retain New Testament phraseology after the historic sense has become obsolete, they were dictated by a laudable respect for scriptural authority, combined with a very inadequate equipment for truly historical

interpretation. Bushnell displayed an instructive appreciation of the lack by prefixing to his work on "God in Christ" a "Dissertation on Language" which proves that language, like other vessels of the Spirit, possesses those qualities of growth, development, and decay which characterized all living instrumentalities. If the old doctrines still have elements of value, they must be restated in modern terms.

The values which religious conservatism inherits from obsolete world-views, and to which it instinctively clings, are those which belong to the religious mind in common with primitive thought in general. The religious mind conceives its relation to the world in terms of *personality*. Per contra, the progress of science tends more and more to substitute *mechanism* as the more appropriate analogy. "Personality" is notoriously one of the most fluid, least settled terms of language. The kind of personality which the theologian now ascribes to God has been repeatedly revised from its primitive anthropomorphism. In particular it is to-day so purified of the element of caprice as to approach indefinitely the predictability of mechanism. With sufficient knowledge of all attendant circumstances and all the requirements of justice, goodness, and love, one could infallibly predict in any given case the course of action of a Being invariably controlled by these attri-

butes. Conversely, the kind of "mechanism" contemplated by the truly modern scientist leaves room for the plasticity of "personal" interest and direction. Neither conception is adequate without the other. Each must be corrected by the other. But the religious mind clings, with a tenacity proportioned to its sense of the values involved, to its basic anthropomorphism. The rational or scientific mind insists that this anthropomorphism shall not usurp the place of mechanism where mechanism affords the truer analogy. In both cases adaptability of "language" lags behind the advance of thought.

The anthropomorphism of religion, like that of primitive thought in general, has been corrected incessantly by the growth of science, and the process will undoubtedly continue. But nothing that science has discovered has ever shown, or even tended to show, that mechanism presents a better analogy than personality for the interpretation of the universe and our relation to it. So long as we posit a Power not ourselves "that makes for Righteousness," there must be theology, definition of personality, divine and human, and the interrelations of the two. And among the chief problems of theology will be the problem of vicarious suffering and that of the forgiveness of sins. Often it may be found needful to provide new bottles for the new wine of religious conviction.

Sometimes it may be sufficient to provide new goatskins. A time may easily come when glass will be found a better material.

v.

Reduced to intelligible terms, the struggle of religious conservatism to-day is, therefore, to retain the spiritual values of personality as the dominant power in the universe. Religious conservatism resists to the utmost that conception of prayer which limits its efficacy to the suppliant, a sort of daily-dozen of the soul performed before the mirror of its own imagination. We cannot go back to the child's idea of prayer. We cannot insist that the new bottles shall still be of goatskin. But the wine must be preserved. If religion is to continue a reality instead of an empty form, the battle must be fought for freedom. It will make little difference whether one believe in a God or not, if personal freedom be an illusion, or if the God believed in be as indifferent to human longing and entreaty as bronze or stone. He that cometh unto God must not only believe that He is, but also that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Both the seeking and the finding must be the real act of real personalities. Prayer, as a mere exercise in resignation to the inevitable, will soon fade into silence.

On the other hand, prayer which counts on over-

riding the wiser will of God is little better than a survival of magic and superstition. Prayer, for the thoughtful man of modern times, must accommodate itself to both necessities. In point of fact, it does. Men still pray as Jesus prayed, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me. Nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." And they still feel, when their will has *not* prevailed, that the prayer was not ineffectual, that its effect was not limited to the psychological reaction upon themselves. They still feel, as Christ felt, that the Father, who answers not visibly nor in word, has received and answered the cry as in the interchange of human personality. God is not so remote as to be inaccessible to the least of us; nor so near that interchange becomes impossible because individuality and freedom have disappeared. This, at least, remains from the fruit of the forbidden tree: mere "behaviorism" cannot rob us of our "knowledge of good and evil" any more than mechanism or materialism can alone explain our world. We do not discard the term "personality" merely because we find it hard to explain or define.

The doctrine of the Atonement, then, is not less vital to Christianity than the doctrine of prayer; for it roots itself in the same soil, the conception of personality. But this conception is subject to the limitations imposed by the advance of thought. We still say (or sing)

I will give thanks unto thee, O Jehovah;
For though thou wast angry with me
Thine anger is turned away.

But we do not mean by it precisely what it meant in the days of Isaiah. We fully and explicitly acknowledge change.

The New Testament writings, more especially those of Paul, have given rise to certain theories of the work of Christ which are properly called "objective" because they retain in higher degree, though always in an accommodated sense, the ancient conception of propitiatory sacrifice. "Subjective" theories, like those of Abélard and Peter Lombard, admit no effect of the cross beyond its effect upon men. Some of these, particularly those of modern times to which we have already referred as the so-called "moral" views, claim a certain measure of "objectivity" through the *indirect* effect the cross may reasonably be believed to have exerted upon God. Just as we may consider it possible for a good and wise Being to confer a blessing in answer to prayer which, unasked, would have been no blessing, and therefore was not conferred, so we may say in regard to forgiveness: "The spectacle of the cross produced a sense of sin, superinduced a repentance which no severity could ever have secured." In any personal view of divine redemption the difficulty lies not in obtaining forgive-

ness for the truly penitent, but in securing such penitence as shall make men worthy to be forgiven. Undeniably the cross has actually had this effect on men. In the past as in the present, men have seen and been moved to penitence, hope, and faith by this proof of love for the unworthy. We may trust that through the ages it will continue to be so.

There is, then, this historic fact. The cross has been a proof to men that God still loves and labors for them, because they accept the calling of Jesus to be a world-redeemer as a calling of God, and, therefore, justly refuse to separate in their minds between the love of Christ and the love of that God for whom Jesus spoke and acted. Something like this "moral" view is traceable in Paul.

The cross and resurrection of Jesus undeniably have had this effect toward the forgiveness of sins. It is conceivable that they had no other, and that God imposed this fate upon His Servant to accomplish this end. This may be the limit of demonstrable "objectivity." But it can hardly be called historical interpretation of the New Testament to say that it presents this view and no other. As exegesis, the "moral" interpretation suffers from "modernity."

How, then, does opinion stand as between "subjective" and "objective" views? As a definition of current belief we may perhaps take the question: "How

does Jesus effect expiation of our sins in heaven?" with the answer given by the Socinian Catechism of Racow:

> First, because he frees us from the punishment of sins by the virtue of his death, which he underwent for our sins in obedience to the will of God. For a victim so precious and so great obedience as that of Christ has, before God, a perpetual power of defending from the punishments of sins us who believe in Christ and have died with Christ that we should not live unto sins. For by the virtue and power which he has obtained full and complete from the Father, he perpetually defends us, and in a manner repels from us by his intervention the wrath of God, which has usually been poured forth upon the impious (which the Scripture expresses when it says that he "makes intercession for us").
>
> Secondly, he frees us from the slavery of sins themselves, since by the same power he withdraws and recalls us from every kind of evil deeds; and that by showing us in his own person what he obtains who ceases from sinning; or even in another way he frees us from the yoke of sin by exhorting and warning us, by giving us help, and sometimes by punishing.[7]

It seems scarcely credible that so "objective" a statement of the Pauline doctrine in its two phases of "justification" (through the intercession of the heavenly Advocate as well as by the sacrifice of the cross which preceded it) and "sanctification" should three centuries ago have been condemned as heresy. These are fair transcripts of Pauline conceptions. They would pass for the orthodoxy of yesterday. They are still enshrined in our hymns and prayers.

[7] Section V, ch. 8.

Be of sin the double cure,
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.

But even these must be committed to the alembic of an "interpretation giving the deeper spiritual meaning" before they can be accepted by the faith of to-day. Our conception of the nature of God forbids us to believe that He does not "free from the punishment of sins" all who are truly penitent, whether they "believe in Christ" or not. Real penitence is indeed, as Moberly points out,[8] "itself the act of God working together with man; for penitence is not perfect until its attitude toward sin is that of the Holy One against whom the sin was committed." Only by such full coöperation of man with God can there be complete atonement. In so far as the sacrifice of Jesus unifies humanity in its striving toward the moral ideal of its Creator, it has indirect effect upon God, making it possible for Him to be both just and the justifier of him that trusteth in Jesus. In this sense all the "moral" views are "objective." Is this, then, what God meant by the cross? And is it all He means by the blood and tears of the innocent?

Let us not minimize this "moral" value. In point of fact, the death of Jesus has had this immense result. The sufferings of countless other martyrs and heroes may have gone to make up that which was lacking of the sufferings of Christ; but *the* sacrifice *par*

[8] *Atonement and Personality,* pp. 31-35.

éminence, the representative sacrifice of penitent, God-seeking humanity for all the ages, is his, and his alone. Because of its relation to the actual history of redemption, his becomes what it is called in the Epistle to the Hebrews, a sacrifice offered "once for all," superseding forever the sacerdotal systems of the ancient world. They were but metaphors and symbols. This was reality. But has the reality, of which this willing sacrifice of Jesus that his Father's name might be sanctified and His kingdom come is the type and culmination, any *direct* effect upon God? That is the question propounded by those who still take an "objective" view of the Atonement. They are not deeply concerned for the particular anthropomorphic modes of thought and expression imposed on the New Testament writers by the conditions of their time. These forms are grown old and perchance are now nigh unto vanishing away. But they *are* concerned for the deeper principle these anthropomorphic terms were designed to express. Born of a religious consciousness which knows no other language, they describe a restoration of mankind through the work of Jesus to right relations with God as of persons to a Person. Admittedly the term Person as applied to God is variable in meaning. It had varied and was varying in New Testament times. We ourselves employ it with perpetual new adaptations of the sense, as they are called for by new discoveries

of science, new inductions of philosophy. This is the proper advance of theology. But there is a constant. Something kindred to ourselves remains.

> Speak to Him, thou, for He hears,
> And spirit with spirit doth meet.

Christian thinking is concerned for this constant. It is not satisfied in its theology of the Atonement with mere subjectivity, because, under whatever changes of form, it still maintains the faith of ancient time in the Personality of God.

CHAPTER II.

SALVATION BY GRACE.

I.

CHRISTIAN antiquity transmits to us the cross as the symbol of divine forgiveness. By this sign the Church is to conquer. The cross is its key to the age-long problem of unmerited suffering. But no authoritative, complete, and final interpretation of the symbol is handed down. Each generation must make its own, and our generation has given abundant signs of dissatisfaction with the interpretations of the past. There are many who would answer this dissatisfaction by a denial of the right to differ. Supposing themselves conservative, they are, in fact, the worst of innovators in that they strike at the immemorial liberty of the gospel, patching together again a yoke which long ago was broken from our necks by the founders and heroes of the faith.

Again, there are some who are satisfied with the so-called "moral view," either modernizing Scripture into conformity with their theology, or (more frankly and logically) acknowledging difference and

claiming the undeniable right of restatement. Whether the "moral" view does not unwittingly discard certain elements of value belonging to the ancient doctrine of "grace" is the matter of present concern.

For there are still others, not less insistent than the most modern of modernists on the right of restatement, who consider that it is not only needful to be genuinely historical in presenting ancient conceptions, however different from our own, but that the "objective" element in the ancient anthropomorphic gospel of the Reconciliation is deserving of consideration for its own sake. It is conceivable that apart from all questions of authority, above and beyond the generally admitted retroactive effect the cross may be supposed to have had upon God, through the influence it exerts on sinners to incline them to repentance and thus make it possible for Him to forgive, the ancient doctrine of propitiation may not have lost all its elements of permanent validity. Men who take this view are prepared, if necessary, to regard the retroactive, or "moral," effect of the cross as the only one which can properly be called "objective." Should such be the final verdict of theology, they are prepared to accept it. But they will not be satisfied with any explanation of the historic symbol of the faith which fails to apply it to that great fact of human experience of which Calvary is the culmination and type, the fact of vicarious suffering. The pri-

mary need, accordingly, is of genuinely historical interpretation of the sources.

The tendency of "liberal" theology in recent years has been to exalt the teaching of the Synoptic evangelists, especially that of the Teaching Source (best represented, in our judgment, in the Lukan form), at the expense of Paul. True, the Pauline Epistles are admitted to be our earliest witness to the Apostolic Message; but Paul was a theologian. He may be advancing only his own theological interpretation of the common gospel. Historical critics to-day are confident of their own ability to go behind the witness of Paul and find a higher authority in the teachings of Jesus. Synoptic tradition, to be sure, is relatively late and anonymous. But sufficient application of the processes of documentary analysis, it is believed, will extricate a document to which we may pin our faith as giving this inspired and infallible teaching on truly apostolic authority. Paul's witness, we are told, should be discounted for its polemic bias. We even have attempts to reverse the primitive tradition of the Church and pronounce some gospel writing to be earlier in date than his Epistles.

Admittedly, Paul treats the life of Jesus only "according to the spirit," that is, from the viewpoint of the purpose and plan of God assumed to be expressed in it. To the historian, this is of course unsatisfactory. Apart from the obsolete character of some of

the late Jewish forms of thought which Paul employs, his mode of treatment is theological from its very foundation, and we are reminded that Jesus did not teach theology. It seems to be assumed that if the critics could only supply us with a well authenticated document containing the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, we could then do without a theology. We should no longer need to raise the question what God means by the suffering of the innocent.

But whence would the teaching of Jesus derive its authority without the doctrine of his mission from God? And that is a "witness of the Spirit," an inference drawn from the experiences of Calvary and after. Even supposing it possible, then, to reconstruct an infallible record of Jesus' teaching, we should not be exempted from the necessity of having a Christian theology. The record would have little value without it. Fortunately, we are not debarred from such an analysis of Paul's teaching as will carry us back to the historical data on which the Apostle rested. Then, when we have combined the Pauline data with all others available, we can follow Paul's example of tracing the purpose of God *in* Christ. We shall have the means of constructing a theology of our own. Paul's interpretation may be exemplary; it cannot be exclusive.

No other method is possible to-day. Unfortunately, it has thus far been too frequently applied

as if the object were to eliminate unpopular features of Paulinism, thus obscuring some of the Apostle's clearest and most positive affirmations regarding the teaching of the Church in and before his time. The basic difficulty with the method as thus applied is the employment of it for the attainment of some higher authority than Paul's, some infallible word of Jesus silencing dispute, instead of following the Apostle's example in seeking to be progressively taught of God. Doubtless we should not rate Paul's authority higher than his Master's. But why depend on authority? Even he that believeth on Jesus believeth not on him, but on the Father that sent him.

Applied as a mere means of attaining some formula of supreme authority, the historico-critical method is open to serious objection from the historical side. In fact, it is no easy task to define precisely what was the religion of Jesus, lacking, as we do, any first-hand witness as to what he actually did and said. For among our extant Gospels, only Mark and Luke are admitted to bear the names of their real authors, and neither of these was a first-hand witness. The method is no less open to objection from the standpoint of theology; because the religious mind cannot rest content with past authority, no matter how perfect. Experience moves on. We do not question the adequacy of the religion of Jesus for his own time. The records, such as they are, depict for us

a man of religiously ideal life experiencing a peace with God which the world seeks in vain elsewhere. Even without the story of Calvary, one might say this. But our knowledge of Jesus' experience is very imperfect, and very much has happened since. We may do our utmost to conform to his spirit of perfect moral beauty, and take home to ourselves all the religious truths which his devout insight into his Father's will has brought within our ken. But we cannot stop there. The mind must go on thinking. Our religion cannot rest satisfied without an explanation of the totality of experience beyond that of Jesus and down to our own times. Theology cannot be content with anything less than the entire realm of history. The full width of the universe is the stage on which its drama advances toward an unknown dénouement. The question of Christian theology, to which the thought of earlier generations has given only a provisional reply, is thus: What significance has the person and work of Jesus, taken as part of the entire history of human aspiration and effort toward the ideal, when viewed from the standpoint of an assumed all-wise, all-loving, almighty Power that makes for righteousness? The first great theologian of the Church may not have answered this question as we to-day would answer it. But at least he had the perception of a theologian that it requires to be answered, and set himself to the task. Without Paul one

does not get rid of the problem, however dissatisfied one may be with the Pauline answer.

We can imagine no more beautiful and devout form of religion than that which seems to have filled the mind and controlled the life of Jesus. From Abrahams to Santayana, it is commonly acknowledged to represent the consummate flower of Old Testament religion, the teaching of Hebrew paternalistic theism. In complete indifference to current debate as to whether this type of life and teaching have also appeared elsewhere in the world, under the teaching of Confucius, or Buddha, or later than Jesus' time, we would ask no better fate for any individual or for the world than that he and it should be so won by this teaching, so conformed in action to this example, that Christendom should be no longer a mere name, but a fact, and a fact of universal dominion. The beneficent effect would probably be undisputed. But even then the religious mind would be forced to put its everlasting question: What was the relation of God to all this? Is there, or is there not, a Creator of the world and Father of our spirits, who worked through Jesus and other servants of His kingdom, and who shapes our ends to this high destiny? The appeal of the primitive Church in proof of God's having raised up His Servant and made him both Lord and Christ was the "witness of the Spirit." God had "poured forth this which ye see and hear." Paul

is more impressed with other effects of the Spirit, but he makes the same appeal. We have no other to-day. The value of the cross is tested by the works of the Spirit.

There may be Christian theologians who will raise serious objection to such a standpoint as this. If we cannot prove the teaching of Jesus an absolute and final authority unparalleled elsewhere, if in addition we look upon his experience as only a part of that total experience on which our faith must be reared, wherein lies his uniqueness? May we not expect some other to present a higher ideal, some later experience to furnish a better basis for religious faith? The fear is needless. Our faith is based on an act of God which, if real at all, was effected "once for all."

As regards ideals to aspire to, we must leave it to those more gifted with imagination than ourselves to suggest something which shall transcend that of "sons and daughters of the Highest," which is the goal of Redemption as Jesus interprets it. As regards his leadership until that goal is reached, we have, and can have, no more than the verdict of history. The records display to us no more than a simple figure of utter and unswerving devotion to a divine ideal. Perhaps it is conceivable that in some future generation another may arise with equal devotion to the same ideal. We cannot say *greater* devo-

tion, nor a *higher* ideal; for both are ultimate. But let another arise *equally* qualified with Jesus to be the leader of humanity toward this goal of sonship and brotherhood, still the new authority would be only a second. The leadership would remain with the first. This name of Jesus is already "given among men." Its replacement by another is unthinkable.

Finally, as regards what the centuries may have to offer of further experience of the mind of God, those who conceive a different ideal,—say that of the Nietzschean superman,—as more in conformity to that which the groaning universe is bringing to birth, will perhaps be able to look upon the growth of the religious consciousness of Israel brought to its flower in Jesus' ideal of sonship and brotherhood as a mere side-current in the history of humanity. Those, on the other hand, who deeply feel that there never can be a higher ideal, and never can be a leader who will more worthily represent it, must continue, so long as this conviction lasts, to think of the figure of Jesus as unique. The past at least is secure. There is a historical uniqueness of which Jesus can never be deprived. Whether we were able to prove his sinlessness or not, we should know he had exemplified complete moral union with God. For humanity's hope he became "obedient unto death." Whether the resurrection appearances which awakened in his followers the conviction that God had

highly exalted him and made him both Lord and Christ were miraculous or otherwise, we should ourselves be sure of his perpetual leadership. If, then, there is to be a Redemption of the world in the Christian sense, it will be in this name. Every added century only increases the witness of history that its foundation lies here, a stone rejected indeed of men, but chosen of God to be the head of the corner. To set aside Jesus, one must first supersede the ideal.

It follows from the foregoing observations that our faith, while guided by the teaching of Jesus, must have for its basis the action of God. This constitutes Christianity a new religion. It brought into the world a new Spirit, a new Life. Nor is this verdict a mere acquiescence in the *fait accompli.* Whatever new tests of truth may be invented by the pragmatist, we do not consciously adopt a religion merely because it works. One can be a temperance leader and not follow Mohammed. We do not commit all our hopes and aspirations to the religion of Jesus merely because it is beautiful, or because it presents a view of God in relation to ourselves which is tender and consoling. The proof is historical. We regard Christian belief as confirmed in its essential principles by the event, and as corresponding to observed reality. Whatever elements we adopt from the religion of Jesus, and whatever we add to or subtract from it, we place within the structure of our own faith

nothing which we do not regard as verified, or destined to be verified, by experience. Jesus inherits and exemplifies a view of God in relation to man in all man's misery which we should like to accept as true. We should feel it a relief to know that the imitation of such a life, however distant and difficult, secured infallibly the divine support. We might be willing to make the complete surrender of life to this ideal without knowing what would come of it, without any confidence of reward other than the worthwhileness of the effort itself. Many have lived Christian lives on just this utter certainty. But the mind does not cease its quest. We cannot be satisfied to know merely the ideas and acts of Jesus. We *must* also ask, How did they work out? What was his fate? If we have not the story of the cross and resurrection to show what answer came to this sublimest appeal of trusting obedience, it remains no more than a beautiful example, one more of those tragic, vain efforts of humanity to reach the heart of God, orphaned entreaties, which through the long ages have broken their wings against the pitiless barrier of the skies.

Religion lives by belief in God, and it must interpret its belief by the experiences of life, omitting none, distorting none. Theology it will have, latent, perhaps, but sooner or later expressed. If such be the verdict of philosophy, the verdict of history is no

less clear. Such has been the fact in the development of our faith.

II.

Through its interpretation of the cross and its experience of "the Spirit," Christianity came to regard itself as a new religion, which had left Judaism behind as a creed outworn. And Judaism was even more convinced of the innovation than Christianity. To Saul the persecutor, the word of the cross was the stumbling-block. To Paul the Apostle, this was the essence of the message. Paul was not converted by what Jesus had said, but by what God had done. The more we know of the religion *of* Jesus, the more difficult does it become to point to anything entirely distinctive in it. The cross marks the dividing line. Judaism has its parallels to the paternalistic theism of the Synoptists. Christianity begins as a religion *about* Jesus, the doctrine that God had made him both Lord and Christ. Even the promulgation of this doctrine would not necessarily have led to separation from Judaism had it not been for the theologian Paul, who showed how much was implied in it. To Paul "the grace of the Lord Jesus" was a new way of salvation which made the way of Pharisaism and the Law impossible: because if one had faith in the forgiveness granted for Christ's sake, one would not

seek justification through any works of one's own. The very attempt would be proof of one's lack of faith. Every plea of personal merit through obedience to written precept or divine requirement would be a confession of lack of confidence. To have real faith in Jesus, one must depend upon him exclusively and entirely. Forgiveness for the sake of Jesus was justification, and no other was attainable. Control in all one's life and action by the spirit of Jesus was sanctification and sonship, and no other was real or adequate. James, Peter, "even Barnabas," thought compromise was possible. Paul was an intransigeant as between law and grace.

Considering the beauty of the religion *of* Jesus, and considering on the other hand the difficulty of the religion *about* Jesus, cast in theological and often polemic phraseology by Paul, considering especially the grotesque elaborations of the Pauline doctrine which have passed since medieval times as the Christian doctrine of the Atonement, one can scarcely wonder at the modern tendency to treat the system of Paul as an intrusion. A certain impatience with Paul's theology is apparent even in so excellent a presentation of "The Christian Doctrine of Salvation" as that of Professor George B. Stevens, of Yale, published in 1905.

Professor Stevens frankly rebels against what he considers the contamination of Christian doctrine in

Paul's mind by "the thought-forms of late Jewish theology." We may dissent from this characterization of Paul's doctrine of grace, but it must be admitted that Paul's conception is by no means the only one of the New Testament, and that it is expressed in theological terms. The modern believer, on the other hand, is not limited to any one New Testament doctrine of salvation, or even to any combination of them. Professor Stevens stands for this liberty:

> Some still maintain the perpetually binding character of Paul's Jewish thought-forms; others venture to seek for Paul's fundamental religious convictions beneath these, and are of opinion that though his Christian theology is cast in these molds, it is not identical with them. What is Pauline? what is Scriptural? Is every conception of which Paul made use a necessary part of his religion, and of ours—physical death due to sin, our sin due to Adam's, Christ's speedy, visible return to earth? As I have frequently intimated, it seems to me that no fruitful investigation of the beginnings of Christian theology can be made without recognizing the distinction between the contingent thought-forms of the first Christian thinkers and the essential religious life and fundamental Christian certainties concerning God and the experience of salvation which they were seeking to expound and to philosophize. Christianity is not identical with the special modes of thought which any particular thinker, speaking the language of his special circle or peculiar education, may use to illustrate and convey to others the most effective impression of its truths. If so, with which of several New Testament types of thought is it identical,—with the ethicism of John, the Alexandrianism of Hebrews, or the legalism (sic) of Paul? The religion of the New Testament is something more than

a composite of the various arguments, analogies, and illustrations employed by its writers (p. 131).

Professor Stevens' "thought-forms of the earliest Christian thinkers" are equivalent to the "altar-forms" of Bushnell. In maintaining that the sacrifice on the cross (if we must ask why God permitted it) was designed, not to obtain grace, but to manifest it, he does not go beyond Bushnell and the "protestants" of *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought.* He occupies substantially the same standpoint in admitting that Christ's work, and specifically his death, were in some way a solemn, supreme testimony to the guilt of sin, and justly denies with them "that punitive retributive justice must be exercised always and everywhere" (p. 255). Perhaps he may be right in his contention that if the "moral" view they advocate be thus extended, nothing else remains to give "reality" to the objective view. It is in the field of biblical theology, however, that his real contribution is made. In two respects he advances beyond his predecessors.

(1) Professor Stevens shows that in spite of a few phrases from Paul's apologetic, which do not adequately represent the thought of even the theologian Apostle in all its bearings, the moral view is fully justified in its claim to be more scriptural, as well as more consonant with the Christian conception of God, than its predecessors. For Paul himself the

cross is a symbol not of God's anger against sin, but of His boundless longing for the return of the sinful. And in this, Paul simply reflects the entire spirit of the Bible and of the best elements of the Judaism of his time.

Even in the Old Testament, it is God who creates the clean heart and renews the right spirit in the penitents (Ps. 51:10-12). It is He who turns men unto him and they are turned (Jer. 31:18), who bestows a new heart, and puts His spirit within men to produce effective obedience (Ez. 36:26f.). It is He who, according to the prophet's prayer in the classical example of national repentance at Elijah's sacrifice on Carmel, has "turned their heart back again." This "turning again," or, in modern language, "repentance" of Israel is in all the prophets, as in the teaching of Jesus, the sole requirement for her forgiveness and complete redemption. But to prophets and Psalmists alike this most inward requirement of all is supremely Jehovah's own. "Turn us again" is the cry when His vineyard lies waste,

> Turn us again, O God of Hosts,
> And cause thy face to shine,
> And we shall be saved.

All parts of the New Testament are filled with this idea of the redemption as a work of God's love. Justly, therefore, do modern theologians raise protest against medieval caricatures of Paulinism which

depict God as needing to be appeased before He can forgive. They should be declared out and out unscriptural. For Paul himself speaks habitually of the sacrifice on the cross as offered by God, doubtless because it is so represented in the prophetic passage fundamental to all his doctrine, the Servant song of Is. 53, in which Jehovah makes the soul (life) of his martyred servant "an offering for sin." The protest raised on this account by advocates of the "moral" view finds greater justification still in the doctrine of the fourth evangelist, who coincides with Paul in the principle that God is love in his very nature, and who is more explicit than Paul in making the Redemption consist preëminently in the infusion of the world with this quality. Professor Stevens rightly holds us guilty of injustice to the New Testament itself if we forget that it consistently maintains that it is God's own love which is commended to us in the fact that "while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." Paul's great follower at Ephesus gives as the essential meaning of Calvary that "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that in him whosoever believeth might not perish, but might have eternal life." Until the prime agency of the redeeming love of God is recognized in it we have not done justice to the Atonement doctrine of Paul and John.

It is well to be more just to Paul and John than our

forefathers. But to be "scriptural" is not all. One may cancel entirely the doctrine of "blood-atonement" and still remain "scriptural" in a partial sense. One may present the "religion of Jesus" without other consideration of the cross than as an incident affecting his own character and example. New Testament authority can be adduced for such a presentation of the Gospel. It contains a factor, as we have seen, which views Christianity as the divinely appointed fruition of Judaism and its logical outcome. This conception appears most clearly in the Epistle of James and the Lukan sources. It represents more nearly than anything else within the limits of the canon that Judaizing type of Christianity which came into conflict with Paul. Indeed, it still remains hard to see wherein it differs from reformed Judaism, since it lacks a distinctive doctrine of God in Christ. For Unitarian Christianity we are not authorized to speak, but Trinitarian Christianity, at least, is divided from Judaism as a new religion by its different conception of God. And the cross marks the dividing line. For the conception of God attained through it and its consequences constitutes the Apostolic Message. That message *is* "the word of the cross," though not necessarily Paul's interpretation of it.

(2) Professor Stevens also goes beyond the protest of the nineteenth century "modernists" (if we may so designate the group of "protestants") in the

formulation of method. By bringing to bear the resources of biblical theology for the clearer interpretation of the New Testament, he shows what differences exist even here, and thus justifies that freedom to interpret the facts themselves which he demands for the modern Christian. This is his real advance upon Bushnell. No other precedure is conceivable for the thoughtful Christian of to-day. The scientific theologian must lay down first "The Biblical Basis of the Doctrine" in order to study its development in historical sequence, differentiating the view of one writer from that of another. Thereafter his own views will be in order. In his summary of this process, on p. 121, Professor Stevens writes:

> We have in Paul the outlines of a fairly definite theory. It is the theory of a substitutionary (sic) expiation. There are adumbrations of it elsewhere in the New Testament, and it is possible, though not to my mind certain, that it was in some measure shared by the authors of First Peter, Hebrews, and the Johannine writings. . . . The traditional doctrines of Atonement are reproductions of Paulinism with variations and additions. Now the questions of special interest here are: (1) What is the relation of this theory to current Jewish ideas of the vicarious suffering of the righteous? (2) What is its relation to other elements of Paul's thought, such as his mysticism and his doctrine of God? and finally (3) What is its availability, or in what form is it available, for the thought of to-day?

The questions thus squarely put are unavoidable for any thoughtful Christian of our generation. Contemporary Judaism certainly had conceptions of the

vicarious suffering of the righteous, current at least since the days of Deutero-Isaiah and his doctrine of the suffering Servant. They involve what we may call the principle of Solidarity, or, in the language of the later Synagogue, *Zechuth* ("imputed merit" or justification on others' account). Where the question of forgiveness on account of the suffering of the innocent is concerned, the special term is *Akeda*, from the "binding" of Isaac as an offering on the altar. Have these beliefs affected Paul's doctrine of Justification through the blood of the cross? If so, how, and to what extent? Are these conceptions utilized in other writings of the New Testament besides the Pauline, and if so, are they traceable to Paul, or were they derived independently? Did they perhaps affect the thinking of Jesus himself? These are scientific questions which the historical critic alone is competent to decide. But suppose them to be decided in the affirmative. Professor Stevens justly holds the question still open: "Are these ancient conceptions still available? Is there any form in which they can still be made serviceable to the thought of to-day?

In the claim of certain modern theories to present an "objective" view of the Atonement, while the force of the predicate is so weakened as merely to declare that, in Christ, God "expressed His righteousness as well as His benevolence," or that He thus "presented a new aspect of His relation to the world," Professor

Stevens finds little value. Such theories, to his mind, either "express what all theories maintain," or else "are too vague and meaningless to serve any useful purpose." "Objectivity," he declares, to have any real sense in such a connection, must have reference to the intervention of a third party acting as mediator or intercessor on the sinner's behalf with God.

Whether Paul's atonement doctrine be justly described as "substitutionary expiation" or not, such "objectivity" is indeed as indispensable to it as to the doctrine of prayer. It presents also the same difficulty. But it presents no more. The man who believes that his mother's prayers and tears on his behalf are not ineffectual, but avail much with God in their working, need have no difficulty with a doctrine of the Atonement which says in effect that the dying prayer of Jesus, "Father, forgive them," was not unheard. Such a conception of the Atonement undoubtedly involves a world-view based on personality rather than on mechanism. It involves difficulties for the theologian at least as great as any it may encounter from the mechanistic philosopher, difficulties which were quite as keenly felt by the thoroughgoing fore-ordinationists of Paul's time as by any modern theologian. But Professor Stevens was far too good and honest an interpreter of the New Testament according to the approved methods of biblical theology not to admit that such "objectivity" is certainly char-

acteristic of the Pauline doctrine of the Atonement, if not also present in the post-Pauline epistolary literature, the Revelation, and the writings traditionally ascribed to John. Historical interpretation demands this before all else, that we place ourselves at the point of view of writers who conceived of atonement in terms of personality.

Professor Stevens thinks it possible to go back of Paul to a time in the history of church teaching when "objectivity" in this sense of personal intercession had not yet appeared. We must take issue with him at this point. All students of the New Testament will admit that the intercession of the risen Christ was greatly emphasized by Paul, that it was even made fundamental to his personal interpretation of Christianity. Moreover, it was expressed in the language of polemic theology as a consequence of the battle Paul was compelled to fight against the Judaizers. But was it an importation of his own, fundamentally alien to the spirit and utterances of Jesus? Or does it belong in some form to the common Apostolic Message "received" by Paul? This question we shall have to consider for ourselves. Advocates of the "moral" view may find a way of escape from the charge of "unscriptural" teaching in the undeniable fact that the Lukan writings and James are free of any such taint. If, however, it should transpire that the distinctive thing which made

Christianity a new religion, over against the legalism of the Synagogue under the Tannaim, was just the fact that it did lay hold of the principle of Zechuth, applying to the cross and resurrection of Jesus those conceptions of the later Judaism which had taken form in the days of the Exile and of the Maccabean martyrs, in spite of the silence of Luke and James, we shall be obliged to ask ourselves the final question whether these ideals are still "available," and if so, in what form.

We have taken Professor Stevens' book as representative of that better method of inquiry which the study of biblical theology has brought in. But we must return for a moment to the work of Principal Drummond, already quoted, to make clear exactly what is gained by this more scientific method. Principal Drummond declares (p. 359f.) that the "fundamental error" of those obsolete doctrines to which he objects is "the doctrine of reconciliation." This doctrine, understood as Drummond would define it, "is directly opposite to the teaching of the New Testament," Drummond's definition of the teaching of the New Testament being also accepted. Since we have just seen that a scientific biblical theology denies the existence of any such thing as a uniform "teaching of the New Testament," and since "the doctrine of reconciliation" even as preached to-day may be quite a different thing from Drummond's conception of it,

there is room here for considerable difference of opinion. However, even Principal Drummond is willing to grant that there may be certain "truths involved in the dogma." Among these is a conception which, however lightly touched, must occupy for the historical interpreter a place of foremost consideration, since it is demonstrably basic to primitive Christian thought. It is the doctrine of "Christ's priestly office of intercession." Principal Drummond declines to lay down precise doctrines for the world of the departed, but he is rightly confident that "Christ does not intercede for men as though he were more merciful or less just than God. He whose meat it was on earth to do his Father's will cannot oppose that will in heaven. Nor can he exhibit his wounds as though God were in danger of forgetting them, or were likely to have his better judgment overruled by this appeal to a mere physical pity." To Dr. Drummond "such ideas represent a mythological anthropomorphism, which can only belong to the Ptolemaic astronomy and an unspiritual form of Christianity." But as a residuum of faith he believes that

> we may fairly think that Christ is still praying for the race which he loved. If intercessory prayer, as an expression of the heart's love, is legitimate here, there is no reason why it should be silent there . . . So if any one finds comfort in believing that he who died upon the cross still cherishes the world in his love, and that one so much

holier than himself prays for all sinful men, I know not why this comfort should be denied him. Only these things are not so much articles of faith as a moral trust in the immortality of love (*Studies*, p. 363).

Thus the door which seemed to have been closed in the face of the believer in "objective" atonement is left standing ajar. And if even moderns are permitted to disregard the distinction of "here" and "there" when they think of intercessory prayer, how much more must the concession be made to believers of New Testament times! To concede this is to concede all that the historical interpreter requires. For it is precisely through this door of vicarious suffering and intercessory prayer that the whole doctrine of salvation "through the grace of the Lord Jesus" entered the New Testament. This may be stated even in anticipation of our historical inquiry.

We take our start, then, from the historical question: What were the beliefs of Jesus' contemporaries? With Professor Stevens, we believe that proper method requires us to ask three questions: (1) What is the relation of Paul's atonement doctrine to current Jewish ideas of the vicarious suffering of the righteous? (2) What is its relation to other elements of the Apostle's thought? (3) What is its availability for the thought of to-day.

We also hold with Professor Stevens that vicarious suffering and intercessory prayer belong to those doc-

trinal developments of "later Judaism" which he believes affected the thinking of Paul, but which he appears to suppose had no effect on the thinking of Jesus and the earlier disciples. In this supposition Professor Stevens appears to us to invert the probabilities. We cannot well imagine Peter, the warm-hearted, unschooled Galilean, as ignorant of, or taking no interest in, the popular beliefs of the time regarding the fate of heroes and martyrs, while Paul, the rabbi, brings them in.

It is a reflection of contemporary *popular* belief when II Macc. 15:12ff. depicts the vision of Judas Maccabæus before the battle with Nicanor as a revelation of the intercession of Israel's martyred heroes:

> He saw Onias that had been high priest . . .with outstretched hands making supplication for the whole body of the Jews. Then saw he a man appear of venerable age and exceeding glory. . . . And Onias answered and said, This is the lover of the brethren, he who prayeth much for the (Jewish) people and the holy city, Jeremiah, the prophet of God. And Jeremiah stretching forth his right hand delivered to Judas a sword of gold, saying, Take the holy sword, a gift from God, wherewith thou shalt smite down the adversaries.

Vision, in antiquity, means the opening of the inward eye to behold realities of the unseen world. The story presupposes the real belief of its authors that the martyred Onias, and Jeremiah, "the lover of the people and the holy city," whom tradition known to

the Gospel writers themselves (Mt. 15:14) regarded as a martyr already exalted to Paradise, were actually there and actually interceding with God for the victory of Judas. The golden sword tendered by Jeremiah is, in fact, an assurance that their intercession had prevailed. This story, as I have said, represents popular belief. It was sharply repressed in the schools. Legalism was always jealously on guard against an abuse of the doctrine of intercession or vicarious grace (*zechuth*), lest it weaken the sense of individual responsibility. The conception of the intercession of the glorified Christ in Paradise as a "lover of the brethren" is of the same popular type as that of the martyred Onias. As we shall see, it was no innovation due to Paul, the theologian Apostle, nor was it drawn from the teaching of the rabbinic schools. It can be traced back to the very beginnings of the faith, before the conversion of Paul, perhaps to Peter himself.

The doctrine of vicarious suffering undoubtedly belongs, in its primary development, to the period of the Exile and specifically to Deutero-Isaiah and the authors of the "Servant Psalms." Martyrology is later still, an outgrowth of the heroic times of the Maccabees. But nothing is more striking in the development of "later Judaism," if by this be meant the teaching of the Synagogue and the Schools, than its jealousy of this popular conception. The doc-

trine of intercessory prayer, at least the intercession of martyrs in heaven, the category to which the intercession of Jesus belongs, was later even than the Isaian doctrine of vicarious suffering. It was still more jealously guarded, and for reasons similar to those which led to neglect of the Isaian doctrine: the swing of the pendulum away from national solidarity toward individual responsibility. Since it is an outgrowth of the Pharisees' great doctrine of resurrection, the doctrine of the intercession of martyrs cannot be earlier than the period of the Book of Daniel. It belongs, in fact, to the development of Maccabean martyrology. Naturally, its chief literary productivity, though not its only documentary attestation, is among the Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria, long familiar with the belief in immortality. It is most fully represented in a Platonized Pharisaism such as brings forth the Wisdom of Solomon and Fourth Maccabees, though we have seen indications of it in a writing of more unmixed Pharisaism, such as Second Maccabees. But even Rabbinic Judaism at a much later date had its struggle, like that of the early Church, against a popular reliance on the merits and intercession of the martyrs in Paradise.

Like the doctrine of personal immortality in its late Jewish (not to say distinctively Pharisean) form of a resurrection of the body, the doctrine of the

intercession of martyrs would seem to be a development of post-canonical Judaism. But we do not reject the resurrection doctrine because it emanates from "later Judaism." Even the fact that it has the hated Pharisees as its chief sponsors is not urged against it. We take it on its merits, and adapt its obsolete forms to such as harmonize better with the discoveries of modern physics. The doctrine of the intercession of saints and martyrs should also stand on its own merits. The fact that it appears to emanate from among the devout people of the land, and has as chief sponsors those successors to the patriotic Chasidim, the religious devotees of Galilee, whose ardor was too precipitate for the learned in the law, is no detriment to its claim to be a legitimate development of Old Testament religion.

It would be too much to expect that, in their New Testament forms, such ideas as personal immortality, intercession, forgiveness, and "reconciliation" should not "represent a mythological anthropomorphism." Myth is but philosophy in its prenatal form. The absence of such traits of the time would be a miraculous exception to all the laws of historical development, and one which the other phenomena of Scripture afford no reason to expect. They do "presuppose the Ptolemaic astronomy." They may even be said to exhibit "an unspiritual form of Christianity"

in the sense that in New Testament times "spiritual" did not mean "non-material." But the issue of today does not concern these obsolete forms. It does not even concern the question of personal survival after death. It concerns solely the question of the personal relation between God and man. Primitive Christians undoubtedly believed that exaltation to "the right hand of God" gave to their martyred Leader an access to the ear of the Almighty which he had not possessed before, just as they also regarded his sufferings for the sanctification of the Name and the coming of the Kingdom as lending unique weight to his intercession. These are simply the particular modes of apprehension of the universal hope, distinctive of that age and people. Such truth values as the forms possess must be appraised by every succeeding generation for itself. The vital, enduring element of the ancient faith appears in what Drummond well terms "a moral trust in the immortality of love." It is indifferent to this trust, when reduced to its essential residuum, whether the intercession of Jesus were from within or from without the veil. It does not depend on the adequacy or inadequacy of the forms of expression available in any given age. Jesus' prayers and sacrifice for "his own" were not conceived in any age to "overrule the better judgment of God." Nevertheless, they have been regarded in all ages as "effectual"

prayers. Our own faith (if we have faith) in them is without reference to past or present, here or there. It is independent of the mere incident of death. It assumes personality in man and God. It is a moral trust in the immortality of love.

It is the misfortune of this whole question of the Apostolic Message that theologians debate it as if it were a matter of biblical authority. Mountains of learning are devoted to determining the exact words which Jesus uttered on a given occasion, and to weighing their precise sense to the millionth of an ounce. The historical and philological inquiry has its value, which an author who aims to make even more careful survey than hitherto should be the last to decry. But it proves nothing on the main question at stake. Many excellent scholars hold (and with their judgment the present writer concurs) that the doctrine of the suffering Servant of Isaiah, primeval as it is in post-resurrection Christianity, and near as it lay to the hand of Jesus, was never explicitly applied by him to his own case. More radical critics (from whose view the present writer feels obliged on historico-critical grounds to dissent) deny that Paul had any better basis for the words he reports as uttered by Jesus at the parting supper than his own "objective" view of the atonement. Paul's view confessedly involves at least a doctrine of vicarious suffering and inter-

cessory prayer in heaven, though not (to our understanding) a theory of "substitutionary expiation." Let it be granted, then, that Jesus did not use at all the words ascribed to him by Paul, or used them in quite another sense. Let it be supposed that the Lukan story of the Supper, unemended by the insertion of the later texts from First Corinthians, and without Markan supplements, represents the actuality; that Jesus had no more in mind than a pledge of reunion with the Twelve in the glorified city of David, to the realization of which he had dedicated himself both in life and death. Still it would be true, even if Jesus did not say it, that he "loved them and gave himself for them." It could be truly said of these his "friends" who had endured with him in his trials. It could be said of his people, through whom he had hoped to the end that his ideal of the Kingdom of God might be achieved. It could be said of that wider Israel of God, of which he had declared in his Galilean teaching that many should come from the east and the west and the north and the south and sit down at the Messianic banquet-table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And because of this wider outlook of Jesus, the object of his love could be individualized, as Paul has individualized it, for every lost son of Adam. Every devotee of that kingdom to all time could say: He loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*.

Taking the purpose and career and fate of Jesus to have been what they historically were, whether the particular words in question were uttered or not, the questions of vicarious suffering and intercessory prayer are before us. We too are fellow-devotees of Jesus, dedicated to the same divine ideal. If we believe in a personal God, we cannot but be interested in the question whether the work of Jesus made or did not make a difference. If we believe in personal immortality, we cannot but be interested in the question whether "he who died upon the cross still cherishes the world in his love," and still "prays for all sinful men." Even if we are skeptical of immortality, the fact of the love, the sacrifice, the intercession is still a fact. The question is that of solidarity, or, in Jewish theology, *zechuth*. Our answer will of course depend upon that which we make to the question of prayer in general. There are those who regard prayer also as merely "subjective." There are others who do not, and who themselves suffer and make intercession for their fellow-men. But they are not to be regarded on this account as thinking themselves "more merciful or less just than God." They suffer, toil, and pray for sinners. But they do not thereby imply the thought that God is in danger of forgetting them, or is likely to have his better judgment overruled by their appeal. They

do not always look for a life to come. But they do believe in a Hearer and Answerer of prayer. They look up to Him not as servants but as sons.

Let us assume that Jesus himself was entirely unaffected by the idea of solidarity as expressed in the doctrine of Zechuth in later Judaism. Let us assume in addition that no religiously minded Jew had ever anticipated Paul by importing it into the primitive Church. Even had there never been a Christian Paul, we of to-day would find ourselves compelled, nevertheless, to confront the question: Did the work, the martyr fate, the intercessory prayer of Jesus for "his own" have any effect on God? Does the love which thus expressed itself still have effect? May we, or may we not, reasonably continue to have "a moral trust in the immortality of this love"? Principal Drummond sees no reason why the comfort of this faith should be denied us. Logically and theologically, it is not apparent why a God to whom personality of any kind is ascribed should not be a Hearer and Answerer of prayer. Logically and scientifically, it is not apparent that our universe is a universe of law alone, leaving no room for grace. Practically, we may endorse the verdict of Frederick Harrison:

> Religion will never again inspire human life until it has recovered the sense of a Supreme Power akin to Man,

an organic Being, within the range of our human understanding, and in magnetic touch with the human heart.[1]

To the present writer this seems to be the real issue at stake on the whole question of an "objective" atonement. No thoughtful Christian will expect to reproduce in modern minds the "mythological anthropomorphism" of later Judaism. No one asks that the conception of personality which it presupposes in God as a basis for its faith shall be defined without regard to the discoveries of science or the reasoning of modern philosophy. But personality does have something to do with the Atonement. The God of our salvation is not just the same in his attitude toward us as if Jesus had never lived and never died to effect the "reconciliation." "Objectivity," in the same sense that we apply the term in speaking of the effect of prayer, does seem to be vital to the Christian message of "grace."

Herein, we may therefore hold, the New Testament writers have still a witness in common for our day. It is quite true that the Lukan presentation of the Apostolic Message is singularly lacking in the special phase of this doctrine so prominent elsewhere. We could not infer from Luke that the *suffering* of the Redeemer contributed anything to the welfare of the sinner. But even the Lukan gospel is emphatic in presenting the *intercession* of the risen

[1] *Creed of a Layman,* 1907, p. 69.

Christ as a fundamental and indispensable condition of salvation. Men are saved "through the grace of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 15:11). Sinners are "baptized into the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of their sins" (Acts 2:38). By this means they put themselves under his protection as belonging to him, and the speaker is convinced that "in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). If Luke is careful not to say regarding Christ's suffering that it was "for our advantage," maintaining only that it was to fulfil the predeterminate foreknowledge and counsel of God, "the things which God foreshewed by the mouth of all the prophets, that His Christ should suffer" (Acts 3:18), still for Luke also it is the work of this exalted Christ in heaven to which alone salvation is due according to a divine decree. Paul, on his part, includes the work of Christ on earth, and in this work the suffering of Jesus is so emphasized as almost to exclude all else. It is the cross which sums up and determines the significance of the whole. It defines the spirit of Jesus as the spirit of humble, self-sacrificing, obedient love. But what gives Paul his gospel is experience of the Spirit. To him this Spirit of Jesus is both immortal and divine. To put any trust in it without complete surrender to its control would indeed be immoral, and

Paul amply defends himself against the charge that he makes this trust an excuse for continuing in sin. But "moral trust" he does put in it, because it is nothing less than God's own love made manifest in human form, in real history. Suffering love may be trusted. God thus "commends" it to us. Being justified by this faith, we have peace with God, rejoicing in the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.

There may be objections not apparent to the present writer to making such moral trust in the immortality of love an "article of faith." That is for the theologians and philosophers to say. The mere historian may surely say without fear of successful contradiction that this *was* an article of faith (perhaps we might venture to say the supreme article of faith) with Paul, if not with primitive Christians generally. For when Paul is concluding the great defense of his gospel set forth to the Romans, declaring the ground of his confidence for justification at the judgment-seat of God, it is to this Intercessor that he looks. He appeals to the Christ that had died for him, yea, rather was risen again to be his Advocate against all charges of the great Accuser (Rom. 8:31-39). Justification, for Paul, absolutely depends on this *intercession* of the risen Christ. Without it, we are "yet in our sins" (I Cor. 15:17). Under modern forms of thought, it is less easy to conceive

the mode of working of intercessory prayer. It may be needful to find new terms for the belief that "he who died upon the cross still cherishes the world in his love," and that one holier than ourselves "still prays for sinful men." Under the forms of thought available to Paul, there could be no more perfect expression of "moral trust in the immortality of love" than to say:

> Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that shall condemn? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, and is at the right hand of God, who maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Yea even in earthly ills we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. But the conviction of my soul is this: That neither death, nor life, nor angels nor principalities (to raise accusing voices against us), nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other created thing, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

He who can put into modern terms Paul's confidence in the love of God, not as an abstract attribute of an impersonal First Cause, but an immortal, working reality, a personal love manifested in Christ Jesus our Lord, the Redeemer who loved us and gave himself for us, will have adequately restated Paul's "objective" view of the Atonement.

b. NEW TESTAMENT SOLUTIONS

CHAPTER III.

THE COMMON GOSPEL AS INTERPRETED BY PAUL

OUR survey of Christian thought on the central doctrine of the faith has reached a preliminary conclusion. No more perfect or adequate statement of its intrinsic value can be devised than that of Paul in his sublime eighth chapter of Romans. Its climax is the rhetorical question: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" But, as the Apostle repeats the question, he significantly changes its form. His religious faith rests not so much on "the love of Christ" as on "the love of God which is *in* Christ," an element of the divine nature brought to full manifestation in the sacrificial death of the Redeemer, an eternal potency (δύναμις) of God from which nothing personal or impersonal, in this world or the next, can ever separate the believer. Paul believes in Solidarity, but in a wider sense than that of Judaism. Its basis is immortal love exemplified in Christ. The particular way along which this faith has been arrived at is one thing, a historical study for the biblical theologian. The question of its validity belongs to the philosophy of re-

ligion. Paul may be right or wrong in the logical steps by which he attains his triumphant "moral trust in the immortality of love." He may be right or wrong in the confidence itself. Still it will be worth our while to follow these steps, if only to make sure we fully appreciate his meaning. Genetic study by comparison of variant forms of the doctrine is the only safe method by which to differentiate the permanent from the incidental. This is the task to which we set ourselves, looking to others more expert in systematic theology or the philosophy of religion to say whether this moral trust is, or is not, justified by human experience.

The most difficult of all problems for the biblical theologian is the Christological, the transition from the Jesus of history to the Christ of theology. The critical historian, brought to the limit of his documentary resources, pronounces Jesus a patriot supremely mindful of the divine ideal for Israel and loyal to it unto the uttermost. In the Gospels his portrait is suffused by the coloration of religious and theological adaptation. The evangelists tell their story for the conversion and salvation of souls, presupposing a certain Christology. This is manifestly and admittedly true of Synoptic tradition, collected after the death of Peter from reminiscences of his preaching, and supplemented in its secondary form from unknown sources. It is even more obviously

true of the "spiritual Gospel," which at a considerably later date recasts Synoptic story in a way to illuminate it from the theology of Paul. In spite of this religious adaptation and coloration of the records, the nationalistic limitations of Jesus' work are unconcealed. Paul himself is as free to acknowledge that Jesus "became a minister of the circumcision for the sake of the promises made to the fathers" as Matthew to report his declaration, "I was not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," or John to depict him as turning away from representatives of the Gentile world to accept death on the cross as the appointed means by which his message should reach abroad to "all men." The Jesus of history, then, is limited by nationality.

On the other hand, Josiah Royce has justly pointed out that what is vital to Christianity is its doctrine of the Spirit. To this it testified from the beginning as its supreme experience. Baptism was everywhere its one rite of initiation, and if unaccompanied by the gift of the Spirit, the rite was treated as void. The article of the Holy Spirit, says Royce, [1] neglected as it has been, is "the really distinctive and therefore the capital article of the Christian creed." It is Paul, the theologian Apostle, who out of his personal experience, under the compulsion of bitter

[1] See the essay, "What is Vital to Christianity?" in *William James and other Essays,* p. 140.

hostility and denunciation, first gave systematic form to this primitive and fundamental witness of the Church. Paul owed his spiritual life, his new birth from God, to this eternal redemptive Spirit, which had been incarnate in Jesus. Paul epitomizes his Christology in the simple identification, "The Lord *is* the Spirit." His gospel was the expression of his own experience, "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God"; seeing that Christ had been "made unto" him first, and to his converts after him, "wisdom from God, and justification and sanctification and redemption." Religion in this form is completely denationalized. It belongs purely to the individual, and is therefore universal. If God be indeed one, God of Gentiles as well as Jews, and if the eternal redemptive Spirit by which men are freed from the bondage of sin and death be indeed His Spirit, then racial and national limitations are matters only of ancient history. For the time being, they had a provisional and pedagogic value. With the cross and resurrection, whose appeal is to a lost *humanity*, they inevitably disappear. Even had Paul not been, like Jeremiah, the great anti-legalist of the Old Testament, "set apart from his mother's womb to be an apostle to the Gentiles," even had it not belonged to his Hellenistic birth and breeding, the very nature of his conversion would have made him such. His experience *was* his message. To become "a

new man in Christ Jesus," to have passed from death into life by infusion of new power from God, to know Christ and the power of his resurrection by a moral death and resurrection with him—this was to be intrusted with a gospel of deliverance for every son of Adam lying in the bondage of sin, hastening toward its inevitable doom. Saul of Tarsus, dead in trespasses and sins, had found justification and sanctification, forgiveness and life, through the faith of Jesus. Could he be expected to limit his testimony to the circumcision?

Paul does not claim more of originality for his gospel than belonged to it by virtue of this personal and individual experience. He freely acknowledges the gospel which he "received," how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and how he was manifested, after God had raised him from the dead, to Peter and those that were with him. He does not claim to have introduced either of the sacraments. On the contrary, both were administered to him by predecessors "in Christ." They were the distinctive rites by which the victims of his persecuting zeal were known, in which, true to the immemorial custom of the East, they had enshrined their most essential beliefs. When Paul interprets the sacraments, if he colors their significance with religious implications of his own, it is not with any consciousness or intention of introducing new ele-

ments of doctrine. He transmits what he "received by tradition (παρέλαβον) down from (ἀπό) the Lord."

Paul does not introduce a new form of the Supper. He does not claim for his churches a baptism of the Spirit not given to all. On the contrary, he takes it for axiomatic everywhere that "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." He claims fellowship for all his converts in the one body of Christ, on the ground that all, like Israel of old, had been baptized into one Spirit, all partook of one loaf. Only that which was to Paul matter of his personal religious experience, his consciousness of the redemptive power of the Spirit of Jesus to all who receive it in the self-surrender of faith, he could neither surrender nor suppress. Others might, or might not, see the necessity of this implication. Some, like Peter, might accept it in word and inconsistently shrink back from its application. To Paul, life in the Spirit was his "gospel," his revelation from God. To question it would have been moral and intellectual suicide; to suppress it, treason to God and man. With Philo, the denationalizing of Judaism was a logical necessity. With Paul, it was a soul experience.

Christianity was the Religion of the Spirit. Royce is right in this. And it was so even before Paul. Only, primitive Christianity had no theologian apos-

tle to draw out the implications of its faith and its experience. Christ was simply the risen "Lord," in whose "grace" it trusted for "salvation." It claimed to have "seen the Lord," and to have "received the Spirit." It had not advanced to the positive declaration "The Lord *is* the Spirit." But it is certainly here in this middle ground of pre-Pauline Christianity, more especially in what we can learn from Paul of the experience and teaching of Peter, that the solution of the great problem of Christology must be found. One important point is already clear: The distinctive element of Paul's gospel is his universalism, a universalism based upon his personal religious experience.

Yet even Paul's universalism had not been attained at the expense of his sense of solidarity. Paul too was a patriot, keenly conscious of the national calling of Israel. Only, with his acceptance of the principle that the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, or perhaps in some measure before it, his sense of solidarity with Israel had been overtopped by his sense of solidarity with a new "Israel of God," an "adoption of the Spirit." His Christ had ceased to be a Son of David, or even a Son of Abraham, in any racial sense. He had once known "a Christ (Messiah) after the flesh." Such he would know no more. The Spirit of God incarnate, the

eternal redemptive Spirit, could find embodiment only in a Second Adam, a Man from heaven. So he recasts the title Son of Man.

Thus "redemption" for Paul had ceased to mean the redemption of Israel, and had come to mean the redemption of a ruined creation subject to "vanity." "Reconciliation" had ceased to mean the restoration of Israel to the favor of Jehovah, as it had meant since the great prophet of the "consolation" of Israel, and had come to mean the restoration of mankind. Paul was still keenly alive to his membership in Israel, even willing to be accursed from Christ for his brethren's sake, his kinsmen according to the flesh; but he was still more keenly conscious of membership in an organism gathered from all humanity, wherein, if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or if one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it. With Paul, the sense of solidarity in human relations was not weaker than in the earlier time. He only extended its application.

And in the proclamation of a gospel of "grace," forgiveness, redemption, salvation, no student of the law and the prophets could ignore, as moderns seem all too willing to do, the principle of solidarity.

Since the days of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, there had been conflict between this principle and its converse, the principle of individual accountability. The pro-

phetic doctrine of Jehovah as a God of righteousness, supreme Judge of all the earth, had inevitably brought about a change. The more primitive tribal divinity might be regarded as influenced by favoritism or caprice. But even as early as Amos, men of clear vision could see that the Creator of the ends of the earth, he who rules the stars in their courses, can have no favorites. Particularism was already doomed. The doctrine of Israel's election could be rescued only by the explanation that it was an election not to privilege, but to service. Amos founds on it a warning of special responsibility, "You only have I known, therefore will I visit upon you all your iniquities." In Deutero-Isaiah, election reaches its noblest climax in the doctrine of the Servant, whose "knowledge" is a means to bring many to righteousness. Israel is Jehovah's "witness" to the nations, a missionary people charged to make him known for the redemption of humanity, even at the cost of its own national life. For even to Isaiah the Servant is already not only "witness," but "martyr." As later interpreters sum up the theme: "God scattered Israel among the nations that He might do the nations good." Thus the tragedy of the Exile is rendered compatible with the fundamental faith that Jehovah had chosen Israel from the beginning as his own special people, his "beloved son." The individual Israelite might well consent to suffer "double

for all his sin." He could and did gladly bear sufferings, which conscience told him were far beyond his relative desert, for the sake of his partnership in the nation; for as thus conceived, his was a veritable partnership with God. In this vision of a far-off seed his soul might well be satisfied. [2] The national election was transfigured into a national mission. It was lost to all save spiritual sight. But it survived.

On the other hand, the sense of individual right was also born. The period of great empires, beginning with the Persian, was the great period of its development throughout the world. Nations were perishing, but humanity was coming to self-consciousness. Personality began to be realized, and with it came a protest against the undue claims of solidarity. Ezekiel fulminates against the doctrine that one man can suffer for another's sin. No more shall the proverb be uttered in Israel to explain the national calamity, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." The soul that sinneth, for its own sin it shall die, and not for the sins of others.

But the poem of Job demonstrates that Ezekiel's protest battled vainly against the hard facts of life. There *is* no established equivalence in the world between merit and reward. The wicked *do* flourish

[2] Cf. Is. 53:10-12 LXX.

to the end. The righteous has no assurance that it will be materially well with him. He may hope that a future world will reverse the inequalities of this, but that merely postpones the problem. God's rule in this world is all man has whereby to shape his expectation for the world to come; and God's rule in this world is not that which the justice of individualism demands. The innocent do suffer for and with the guilty. The ties of kinship and nationality are real and cannot be broken. Indeed, why ask it? Shall Jehovah himself groan and suffer when his covenant people by disloyalty compel him to give them up, mourning over the son whom he called out of Egypt, and shall men renounce obligations of blood, demanding release from the common burden? Over against Amos, the prophet of righteous doom, stood Hosea, the prophet of election in immortal love. The doctrine of divine election stood; but for Paul a spiritual seed of Abraham took the place of Israel.

In New Testament times the problem of solidarity against individualism was still urgent. We shall see cogent evidence of this when we take up the inquiry why Luke's account of the doctrine of forgiveness through the grace of the Lord Jesus so strikingly differs from Paul's. But it is manifest also in the question raised by those Pharisees whom the fourth evangelist introduces in debate with Jesus as to the

man born blind. Jesus denies that the blindness is due to sin, whether of this man or his parents. To take refuge with Basilides in prenatal sin is only an evasion of the problem. Past and future alike belong to the unknown. Jesus' answer takes refuge in neither. Suffering is in the world, says Jesus, that God's "glory" may be manifested in triumph over it. How the triumph comes is not explained, for miracle gives no explanation. Nor do we understand the primary necessity for a world of interfused, struggling good and evil, a creation only half emerged from chaos. We only see the light in the darkness, at work to overcome it. Why the darkness should be there we know not.

By one method, however, we may get clearer light on this unsolved problem of the ages, this moral government of God that seems so far from moral when looked at from the standpoint of the modern individualist. We can turn back toward the standpoint of Paul, and from Paul still farther back toward the time when Christian faith still lingered in the lap of the national religion whence it sprang. Paul's doctrine of atonement is a Reconciliation of the world, in which "the world" only occupies the place of Israel in the older faith. It is built on the more primitive doctrine of Jesus as the Servant, which Paul tells us he "received," and this on a doctrine

more primitive still. If we subtract that element of universalization which we know to have been Paul's special "revelation," we reach a simple ideal of self-devotion for the nation. This stands out in clear relief from the life and death no less than from the words of Jesus, and was perpetuated in the rite by which he was remembered. Whatever more he may be found by the theologian, to the historian Jesus was a patriot inspired by the divine ideal for Israel, and loyal to it unto the uttermost.

If, then, we approach primitive Christianity through the only witnesses which survive unchanged from its earliest beginnings, the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper, both will be seen in their very nature to embody a sense of solidarity. Both observances mark a distinction between participants and the non-initiate, and give it the strongest expression of which the Church was capable. Paul also uses both sacraments as attestations to the truth and authenticity of his gospel. It is true that he individualizes and universalizes. Missionary exigencies may lead him to tincture their symbolism with special applications based on his own individual experience. But it is psychologically and historically incredible that Paul could effect any vital change in the meaning attached to these fundamental rites by the Church as a whole, even had he wished to do

sq. And such change as Paul does effect was not in the direction of nationalism or particularism, but strongly against it.

The primitive believer confessed Jesus as "Lord," and was baptized "into the Name" in order that he might participate in the "grace" enjoyed by the brotherhood. The symbolism had been employed by the Baptist, but was in origin pre-Johannine. It signified, for John and Christians alike, "turning back" (*teshubah*=μετάνοια=repentance), return from the estrangement of an unfilial life to filial obedience. But John's disciples were not mere individual reformed men. They had a group consciousness. As the contemporary Synagogue imposed "proselyte baptism" on converted heathen when they became adopted members of Israel, thus symbolizing the washing away of the pollution of idols, so members of the Johannine reformation movement used immersion to typify their solidarity as a "people prepared for (Jehovah's) coming." It was doubtless this forward look, rather than the symbolism of cleansing, which made Jesus a willing participant in the rite, to the perplexity of later apologists.

After the crucifixion the disciples of Jesus adopted baptism to initiate members into their own brotherhood, but with a sharply defined difference. The rite continued to hold all of its previous symbolism of repentance and forgiveness. In still higher de-

gree than in the Johannine sect, it produced a new group-consciousness. But above all, it acquired a new significance through the novel experience of "the Spirit of Adoption." The "gifts of the Spirit" were received as an assured token of divine acceptance, and an "earnest" of a share in the world to come. To Paul the "gifts" were nothing in themselves, everything if manifestations of the indwelling spirit of Jesus made sovereign in the soul. Death and resurrection with Christ is therefore to Paul the only symbolism at all adequate to express the real meaning of Christian baptism. When in writing to the Romans, whom he had never seen, Paul employs this deeper symbolism as something self-evident ("or are ye ignorant?" Rom. 6:3), we may suppose, if we will, that he is viewing the rite in a certain aspect specially adapted to the lesson he wishes to bring out, just as seems to be the case in his rebuke of the Corinthians for their disregard of similar implications of "the communion of the Lord's death" (I Cor. 11:20-29); but it is insupposable that Paul is attempting to bring in new doctrine, whether as respects the ordinance of baptism or of the cup. To all Christians baptism was a symbol of repentance and loyalty. But it was also a ceremony of initiation. It made the believer "belong to" the Lord whom he acknowledged. Later we shall have more to say regarding the primitive "teaching

of baptisms." For the present it is enough to note that it obviously perpetuated the sense of solidarity with a "people of God." It signified adoption into a "household of the saints."

Equally emphatic would be the result of any historical inquiry into the significance of the Supper. As we shall see, there are Petrine as well as Pauline versions of its meaning. Paul finds much fault with the mode of observance which had become customary at Corinth, and insists on a more sacramental ritual and more mystical interpretation. He may even be quoting quite freely the traditional words of institution, paraphrasing the utterances of Jesus by words of his own intended to bring out more clearly the sense approved by his own religious experience. But the limits of variation in such a connection are narrow. It is psychologically and historically insupposable that Paul changed the accepted meaning of the rite in any important particular. More than this. Knowing as we do the special lines of Pauline logic, possessing abundant instances of his method of "universalizing," we can say, within limits, just what sort of change is to be looked for. Certainly it is not the case with any early Christian liturgy that it shows less of the sense of solidarity than Paul. The early prayers, the faithful sayings, the Petrine form of administration of the Supper represented in Luke are all emphatic as respects the idea

of partnership with Christ. "If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him" is the ancient watchword. Paul, it is true, lays special stress upon the fellowship of the sufferings. Others are more intent upon the "gathering together of the elect" in the new Kingdom of David. But all unite in the witness that the token was given to memorialize a partnership (κοινωνία) that death itself should not sever. The supper was not in the strict sense an "article of faith," but it certainly betokened for all who in ancient time partook of "the communion of the Lord's body" what Drummond so justly terms "a moral trust in the immortality of love."

There was another type of universalism in the primitive Church which stood at the opposite pole from Paul's, and yet in the practical outcome might seem to reach the same substantial result. Were we to judge by the only writing of our canon which bears the name of James, we should find it difficult to account for the bitterness of Paul's quarrel with "those from James" at Antioch. But the Epistle ascribed to James belongs to a later age, and while it probably reflects its author's conception of the teaching of the real James, the conception is idealized. It is adapted to a form of Christianity in which "the twelve tribes of the Dispersion" had definitely taken the place of the twelve tribes of Israel. The Epistle of James is addressed to the former. It ig-

nores the latter. If we would do full justice to the nationalistic aspects of Jesus' historical career, we must take account also of the James whom we know through Paul and Acts, and of that older element of the Church which looked upon itself as the original stock and would have none of Paulinism save as subsidiary to its own prerogative.

Followers of this type of Christianity set up in Jerusalem shortly after the crucifixion a little caliphate under leadership first of James, the Lord's brother, then, after the stoning of James in 62 A.D., under Simeon, a cousin. Next to certain "pillars," among whom James took the lead, came the rest of "the Twelve," and after these, "Jesus' mother and brethren." Among these Jewish Christians great stress was laid on Jesus' descent from David as well as from Abraham, and upon his glorification of the law. If one would enter into life, he should keep the commandments. Not, of course, the old only, as a Palestinian evangelist repeatedly reminds the reader (Mt. 5:17-20; 13:52; 19:19), and not without elimination of obsolete elements under proper authority (Mt. 16:19; 18:18), but the law of Moses in the higher interpretation of Jesus, supplemented by the new commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." If contemporary rabbis welcomed and praised the resident alien (*ger*) obedient to the Torah, or even compassed heaven and earth,

that they might make one proselyte, these Palestinian followers of Jesus were certainly not less liberal to Gentile converts than their Jewish contemporaries. They held up to shame the unbelief of Israel by the example of the believing centurion. They told of a "Canaanite" woman whose faith was rewarded by Jesus. They were indeed careful to point out that in both instances it was a case of Gentiles coming to him in obedient faith, not of his going to them. The Canaanite woman whom Matthew substitutes for the "Syrophenician" of Mark "came out of those borders," so that Jesus, in Matthew's version, had no need to trangress his own commandment to the Twelve not to "enter any way of the Gentiles." They were catholic as Rome to-day claims to be Catholic —by absorption.

James himself, according to Acts, has the universalism belonging to the broader Judaism of his time. The Rabbis applied the beautiful ninety-first Psalm, which tells of Jehovah's love for those who "take refuge under the wings of the Shekinah," to the proselyte. The proselyte was he who should enjoy this special favor because he had "set his love" upon Jehovah, and come to "know his name" (Ps. 91:14). In the same spirit, James, the Lord's brother, stands within the sacred precinct of Jewish "purity" and offers a welcome to all "the residue of mankind" who will rid themselves of "the pollutions of idols."

He does not even insist on acceptance of the Torah. Abstinence from the things which make "sinners of the Gentiles" particularly obnoxious as a source of contagion to Jewish and Jewish-Christian "purity" will suffice. James and the Jerusalem church as a whole are convinced that "decrees" to safeguard the purity of "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" will solve the whole problem caused by the influx of converts from heathenism. The words of the prophet Amos will thus be fulfilled:

> After these things I will return,
> And I will build again the tabernacle of David,
> which is fallen;
> And I will build again the ruins thereof,
> And I will set it up:
> That the residue of men may seek after the Lord,
> And all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called,
> Saith the Lord, who doeth these things.

Safety first for the purity of the new Israel. Admission to its asylum thereafter of as many as give evidence of a divine call. This is far from illiberality if reckoned from the standpoint of contemporary Judaism. It rivals some of the great sayings of the school of Hillel as to God's welcome of the proselyte. It reminds us of Jonah and the prophets, of the Psalmist, who counts men of Egypt and Babylon, of Philistia, Tyre, and Ethiopia, among those who know Jehovah, of the blessing of God in Isaiah on "Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my

hands," as well as on "Israel mine *inheritance*." It even recognizes the legitimacy (after Jesus' death) of missions to the Gentiles (Mt. 24:14; 28:19). But it is still a long way from Paul's doctrine of the new economy inaugurated by the cross. It is not based on his conception of purity through the blood of Christ, brotherhood by adoption of the Spirit. Its kingdom of David in a glorified Jerusalem, whose gates are opened wide that the kingdoms of the world may bring their glory and honor into it, after the rebellious have been destroyed, is quite a different ideal from that of the new humanity bound together in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace.

We may well recognize, therefore, that Paul had some reason for regarding his doctrine "that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel," as a "mystery which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men." He might well regard it as a special divine revelation to himself through the Spirit. On the other hand, we are sure that he did not regard it as something opposed to the gospel preached by apostles who had been in Christ before him. It was but an implication they sometimes failed to see or admit. But if, finally, we know from his own frequent allusions that this gospel given to him was nothing else save "the word of the cross" confirmed

by an inward experience of the redeeming grace of God through the indwelling Christ, then we shall be interested to inquire how Paul reached this broader universalism. Out of what preëxisting elements did he construct that doctrine of the Spirit, that assurance that God in Christ, or through his agency, was restoring the world to His favor, not reckoning unto men their trespasses, which Paul declared to be not his gospel only, but the common proclamation committed to all. Whence did he derive that message intrusted to him as God's ambassador of peace to the world, on the basis of which the whole structure of Christian theology has been erected?

We shall need to go back to the first embodiments of the Church's message. We shall need to consider that doctrine of the Servant, to which Paul himself looks back as preceding his own conversion, that doctrine that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," which must indeed have been the very provocative of Pharisean persecution and to which every Christian community "from the Lord" onward bore witness in its memorial rite. We shall need to go farther still, to contemporary Jewish ideas of solidarity, the doctrine of Zechuth, as it had come to be developed in Jewish dialectic since Isaiah and Ezekiel. For we must understand not merely how Paul could find a basis for his doctrine of the "rec-

onciliation" in the teaching of Jesus, but also how there could be such diversity in the record that in at least one important witness only a truncated form of the doctrine appears. What did Jesus say or do that could produce such divergence almost from the start as regards the central message of the faith? How could Paul on the one side find it in the symbolism of the two sacraments, forgiveness through the blood of Christ shed for our "reconciliation," new life in the Spirit through baptism into his name; while Matthew on the other finds it in obedience to the enlarged commandment of a second Moses, soon to return to judgment as an apocalyptic Son of Man?

To get at the historical roots of Paul's doctrine of Atonement, or Justification by Faith, we must reverse his process of denationalization. "Justification" and "Faith" were terms unknown neither to primitive Christians (Mt. 21:32=Lk. 7:29f.[3]) nor to the contemporary Synagogue. Paul gives them both a wider and a deeper sense. But, as we have seen, the key to Paul's wider doctrine of solidarity is his substitution of the individual for the "many" in the time-honored Isaian formula. Paul reveals the very heart and soul of his special gospel when he protests

[3] On the significance of this Q logion see Bacon, *Expositor*, VII, 93 (Sept., 1918), on "John as Preacher of Justification by Faith," pp. 182-196.

in denouncing Peter's desertion of what the Apostle to the Gentiles regards as a vital element of the faith:

> For I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God. I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me.

The allusion to the sacrament (or perhaps both sacraments) is unmistakable. Paul is speaking of that moral participation in the death of Jesus which to him was vital to all true celebration of the "communion." But for us the point of chief significance was found in the change to the personal pronoun, the deliberate and conscious substitution of the individual "me," for the aggregate meant by the Church when it declared that Christ "loved" it and "gave himself" for it.

Paul also, on occasion, can speak of Christ's having "loved the Church and given himself up for it" (Eph. 5:25). In Rom. 4:25 he declares that Jesus was "delivered up for our trespasses, and raised for our justification," where the pronoun refers to the whole body of those "who believe on Him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead." His death was a sin-offering for their sakes, his resurrection an entrance into the heavenly audience-chamber to make intercession on their behalf. No one will

question that it is the same utterance of Jesus which is referred to in each instance, nor that Paul is making a special adaptation of the saying to his individual case when he makes his personal profession of loyalty in the form, "He loved *me,* and gave himself up for *me.*" But it is this individualization which marks the change from a primitive, half-Jewish doctrine of Zechuth, admissible even to rabbinic Judaism so long as the martyr had been one to give his life for the people of God ("the one for the many"), to a doctrine of "grace" which made void the "righteousness which is through the Law."

While the Supper still implied only a doctrine that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," there was no reason why a devout Jew should not participate in it if he believed in Jesus as the Christ, and, without individualizing, conceived of himself and his Jewish fellow-believers as "the Israel of God." The careful study of the Jewish doctrine given to it by such scholars as Bousset in his *Religion des Judenthums,* and the group of scholars at Chicago who published their studies in 1909 under the title *Biblical Ideas of the Atonement,*[4] makes this clear. Their results may be summed up in the discriminating words of Professor Burton:

[4] Joint work of Professors E. D. Burton, J. M. P. Smith, and G. B. Smith.

Of atonement for the nation through the suffering of the righteous members of the nation there are traces in Josephus and IV Maccabees. The thought seems to be that when the nation has sinned, God must manifest displeasure with their sin, and that he may do this, if he will, not by punishing the whole nation, but by permitting evil to fall upon a few who are representatives of the whole. . . . If we may discern any constant doctrine running through these later writings, it is that the *individual* is forgiven when he repents and lives righteously; the sin of the *nation* may be forgiven in consequence of a manifestation of the divine wrath falling upon the righteous representatives of the sinful nation, or of an act of notable righteousness by an individual, even though this involves no suffering on his part (p. 254).

In First Peter we have such an identification of "the elect of the Dispersion" in Asia Minor with the new Israel of God, in combination with a very clear and explicit identification of Jesus with the suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. In I Pt. 2:21-25, the example of this blameless, uncomplaining victim is commended to these once wandering members of the flock, and in this sense the Pauline declaration (II Cor. 5:15) is applied, that he

bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness.

The writer even continues to parallel the Isaian passage by adding:

By whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were going astray like sheep; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Overseer of your souls.

Again he returns to the vicarious suffering of Jesus in 3:18, declaring that:

> Christ also suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for (ὑπέρ) the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God.

He continues this Pauline mode of speech (*cf.* Eph. 2:14-18) by a reference to the resurrection as effecting our justification, or our "good conscience toward God," through the "appeal" which Christ makes on our behalf, since he "is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers having been made subject unto him" (*cf.* Rom. 8:34-39). But while the use of Pauline terms is clear, it is less certain that the writer is equally thorough-going in his individualism. There is atonement and reconciliation for the people of God, but would not Peter have said that for the individual sinner the way of salvation lies first through the door of repentance unto membership in the Israel of God, after that to become a sharer in the blessings of the blood-bought Church? The question is perhaps beyond our power to answer. But the very fact that it is so difficult proves how easily the rabbinic distinction between Zechuth for the nation and Zechuth for individuals was lost when the gospel became denationalized.

We shall have occasion later on to inquire further concerning this distinction of "justification" for the

nation and "justification" for individuals. At present, there is more need to consider another effect of Paul's individual religious experience on the common apostolic message of which he became the great bearer to the Gentile world.

In one fundamental respect Paul's conversion left his life motives unaltered. After it, as before, his supreme aim was "righteousness." Under this single term δικαιοσύνη, *zedakah*, he included both elements of his later soteriology, "sanctification" as well as "justification," so that when he speaks of seeking "a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the Law," as against "the righteousness which is of faith," we are at a loss whether to render the Greek word as "righteousness" or "justification." When as persecutor he first encountered those of this Way, we may reasonably infer from his references to the "stumbling-block of the cross," Christ as a "curse," and similar expressions, that it was the belief symbolized in the rite of the bread and wine, forgiveness "through the grace of the Lord Jesus" that chiefly aroused his antagonism. To use the deeply significant expressions in Hegesippus' account of the martyrdom of James, the doctrine obnoxious to "the scribes and Pharisees" related to "the 'gate'[5] of

[5] In Eusebius' extract from Hegesippus (*H. E.* II, xxiii. 8) the word employed is θύρα as in Jn. 10:7. The original (Aramaic?) form of the story must have used the term *she'ar* (πύλη) common to Is. 26:2 and Ps. 118:19.

Jesus the crucified." The allusion was to Ps. 118:19ff.:

> Open to me the gates of righteousness:
> I will enter into them, I will give thanks to Jehovah.
> This is the gate of Jehovah;
> The righteous (justified) shall enter into it.
> I will give thanks unto thee; for thou hast answered me,
> And art become my salvation.
> The stone which the builders rejected
> Is become the head of the corner.

How the primitive Church employed the passage may be seen not only in the New Testament (I Pt. 2:7; Mk. 12:10f. and parallels), but in Clement of Rome (ch. xlviii.), who emphasizes the fact that while many "gates" (plural) are spoken of as "opened," the only "gate (singular) which is in righteousness" (secures justification) is "that which is in Christ." Moreover, primitive teaching makes clear that the "salvation" spoken of is given to those who are, as Paul would say, "justified by faith," since it is this same passage which plays the chief part in the rabbinic glorification of "faith." It is the same passage of the Midrash which deduces from Gen. 15:6 (Paul's impregnable rock of Holy Scripture, Gal. 3:6; Rom. 4:3ff.) that Abraham inherited both this and the future world through the merit of "faith," which also declares on the basis of Ps. 118:20 in combination with Is. 26:2 ("Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation that keepeth 'faith' may enter

in") that all "men of faith" enter through this "gate of God."

It is self-evident that the Rabbis did not take their scriptural proofs of "justification by faith" from Paul. But if not, the relation between these teachings is that of common origin in contemporary Judaism, and the difference between Jewish and Christian application lies only in the special significance given to "faith" through the personal religious experience of Jesus and Paul.

But if manifestly we must recognize a broadening of the primitive doctrine of justification by faith as expressed in the ritual of the Supper through the special experience of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, we must just as surely recognize a deepening, if only through Paul's inward conflict, of the common doctrine of the gift of the Spirit.

When Paul undertakes to tell how he became a Christian he leaves no room for doubt as to the nature of the inward struggle he passed through. It was not in the least a feeling of misgiving, compunction, doubts and scruples regarding the propriety and justice of his persecuting career. In this he "verily thought he did God service." He was not conscious of any tendency whatever to admit the possibility outside or in opposition to the Law of a "gate of Jesus," through which the righteous might enter by faith. He *was* conscious to the verge of despair

of his failure through the inherent "weakness of the flesh" to meet the Law's ideal. Exactly that triumphant joy and peace in believing, unconquerable even in the pangs of death, which he continually encountered in victims such as Stephen, "a man full of the Spirit," was for him the unattainable thing. Now it is not to be imagined that Saul the persecutor did not know the Christians' rite of baptism. It was this initiatory rite which distinguished them. Everywhere they were known by the exercise of those "gifts of the Spirit" on which they prided themselves as proving them to be the true "heirs of the promise." When Saul "testified against them" he certainly was not ignorant either of their initiatory rite of "baptism into the name of Jesus," confessing their "faith" in him as "Lord," or of the teaching they connected with it. As persecutor he was thrown continually face to face with men who knew and manifested the joy of Jehovah's salvation and were upheld even in martyrdom by His free Spirit. True, comparatively little is said in Synoptic story of the inward manifestations of "the Spirit" when we set it over against the doctrine of Paul. In Petrine tradition, all emphasis is laid on the outward manifestations, which (as Paul points out I Cor. 14:22) "are for a sign to the unbelieving." In primitive apologetic it is not surprising that "miracles," "tongues," "governments" (in the form of divine

penalties on unworthy members of the community, Acts 5:1-11), surrender of possessions "to feed the poor," "prophecy," should tend to eclipse the more abiding and inward "gifts" of faith, hope, and love. Not that love, hope, faith are ignored, even in the apologetic tradition, but they are presented in their outward manifestation, the *services* of love, the *expressions* of hope and faith in "exultation" and "joy."

Nevertheless, making all allowance for apologetic motives, a surprising contrast appears when we compare, on the one hand, Petrine tradition in its narrative form, Mark's "wonder-loving" Gospel and its sequel in Acts, on the other, Paul's complete subordination of the external to the internal effects of "the Spirit." One is at first inclined to ascribe it to some miraculous illumination of the great Apostle's mind that he should so clearly foresee the "passing away" of the outward manifestations in order that the root-principle of "love" might abide. But Paul himself claims no originality in this. He presents it as a necessary implication of the fundamental gospel embodied in the rite of baptism. Paul goes deeper than others by virtue of his personal religious experience. All Christians distinguish their form of the rite from that of John on the ground of a saying of Jesus, "Ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit." It is the universal and com-

mon gospel that "the gifts of the Spirit" are a fulfilment of this "word of the Lord." The contribution of Paul is only that to him the gifts of the Spirit par excellence are faith, hope, and love. He brings into the foreground these moral values which, whether present or not in the intention of Jesus, were really vital, though they tended to be obscured through the exigencies of apologetic. Whether we have not also to recognize the influence of a type of Hellenistic mysticism represented in the Epistle of James in this more ethical form of the doctrine of the Spirit, we have still to inquire. Meantime, the contrast between Paul and Petrine tradition as embodied in the synoptic writings is unmistakable.

Once more we confront a problem similar to that involved in our inquiry into the effect of Paul's individual experience upon his interpretation of the symbolism of the Supper. By individualizing the application of Jesus' "covenant" he made it universal. Every soul of man or angel that feels the need of Atonement, "Reconciliation," is brought near to the God and Father of Christ as he partakes in the rite by "faith." Paul may, or may not, have been conscious of the transition effected through this individualization, abolishing the rabbinic distinction between Zechuth for the nation and Zechuth for the individual. He *was* sublimely conscious that he had been intrusted with this "gospel," whether others

who observed the rite admitted the implication or not. In like manner his personal experience of "the Spirit" as an inward power from God accomplishing that moral renewal which the Law could not effect "in that it was weak through the flesh" was nothing less to him than a revelation from God, undeniable, irrepressible, a message for humanity. Others might look only on outward effects, might be blinded by them to the true significance of "the promise of the Spirit." This could make no difference to Paul. In the gift of the Spirit he, Paul, personally, had experienced deliverance from humanity's bondage to sin and death. Just how much of this liberating experience we should ascribe to Paul's contact with "the Spirit of Jesus" shining through both face and action of men like Stephen the martyr, how much to knowledge of the life and teaching of Stephen's Master, and how much to direct contact with the risen Christ himself from beyond the veil—these are questions of deep interest, but subordinate. Paul had come to know "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" making him "free from sin and death."

Paul, then, does not give us the Apostolic Message in its primitive form, but broadened and deepened. His gospel was denationalized. Nevertheless, since he does not consciously change, but only enriches from his own experience,—since he does not conceal from us, but on the contrary uses every effort to

make clear and definite precisely what he regarded as his own special revelation and message, and to prove it a logical implication of the common gospel, —it should not be beyond our power to see both factors in true perspective. We should be able to recognize both Pauline and pre-Pauline Christianity. With the aid of other strands of the apostolic teaching, affected as they may be in greater or less degree by Paul, with no little aid also from the teaching of the Judaism of apostolic and even post-apostolic times (since influence from Christian sources on rabbinic teaching is scarcely conceivable save in reaction against it), we may look forward with no little hopefulness to such an inquiry. It may be that some further light will be thrown on that great problem of the history of religion, how Jesus' gospel of the reconciliation of Jehovah to Israel became the religion of world-wide redemption through the Spirit.

CHAPTER IV.

THE WITNESS OF PETER

IT has been pointed out that the Pauline system revolves around two foci: (1) Justification by faith as symbolized in the sacrament of the "communion"; (2) Sanctification, or (in phraseology more characteristic of Paul) Life in the Spirit, as symbolized in baptism. All Paul's expositions of his "gospel" center upon these two inseparable doctrines. [1]

The Gospels which have the witness of Peter as their foundation are obviously built on a similar two-fold basis. The great division between a Galilean and a Judean ministry, so strikingly apparent in Mark, continues unobliterated through all subsequent Gospel composition. And the further back we go, the clearer the motive becomes. Mark's story as a whole has been called "an extension backward of the story of the cross." In a sense this is true, since this evangelist is peculiarly dominated by a soteri-

[1] Bacon, *Harvard Theological Review,* VIII, iii., "Reflections of Ritual in Paul," pp. 505-524.

ology like Paul's. He preaches life by participation in the death of Christ (cf. Mk. 10:17ff. with Mt. 19:17). But manifestly it is straining a point to apply the description to more than the second part of the Gospel, the story of how, after Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ," Jesus led the way to his martyr fate in Jerusalem. The earlier part, covering Jesus' activity from the Baptism of John to his departure from Galilee, is concerned with an account of

> how God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power, so that he went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him.

The summary is Peter's, in the account of his preaching to Cornelius. It describes exactly the nature of Mk. 1:1-6:52, except that in the utterance to Cornelius Jesus' ministry of healing is distinctly ascribed to his "anointing with the Spirit" (cf. I Jn. 2:7), and is thus brought into a little more definite relation with the baptism.

Luke, again, shows his appreciation of the connection between Baptism and Ministry by introducing as an immediate sequel to the former the story of the Rejection in Nazareth (Lk. 4:16ff. following 4:1-15). In a story obviously based on the Isaian song of the Election,

> Behold my Servant whom I have chosen;
> My Beloved in whom my soul is well pleased:

I will put my Spirit upon him
And he shall declare judgment (*mishpat*=true religion)
to the Gentiles,

Luke had just related how Jesus was commissioned from heaven to his world-wide task by an anointing of the Spirit. Now he relates how among his own countrymen he offered himself and was rejected, and the passage chosen as representative of Jesus' preaching is the Isaian song of the Anointing of the Servant with the Spirit:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me;
Because he "anointed" me to proclaim good tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.[2]

Whatever the source of Luke's "programmatic discourse" at Nazareth, its author had the same conception of Jesus' mission as the author of the story of the Baptism. Jesus was the Anointed Servant of Isaiah. His baptism was "an anointing of the Spirit."

The connection between the baptism of Jesus and his preaching and healing in the Galilean ministry is made clearer still in the docetic teaching of Cerin-

[2] Is. 42:1 ff. and 61:1 f. The versions given are those of the New Testament writers (Mt. 12:18-21 and Lk. 4:16 f.), who, if they vary from the original, only show thereby the more clearly the sense in which they applied it.

thus, who favored the Gospel of Mark because it seemed to give countenance to his own adoptionism. According to Cerinthus, Jesus until his baptism was an ordinary man. In it he became the "receptacle" of the divine Spirit, and thereafter "began to do miracles and to reveal the unknown Father." It was accordingly Jesus' baptism which, in the view of Cerinthus, endowed him with the word of knowledge and the word of power.

A survey of the opening division of Mark (the Gospel reported to represent the preaching of Peter) extending from the baptism of Jesus to the Galilean prototype of the Supper (the miracle of the loaves and of triumph over the powers of storm and darkness) will show that we must distinguish between material and adaptation. The editor's arrangement of his material contemplates broadly a historical progress from the Beginnings (1:14-39) through Opposition (1:40-3:6), the Choosing of the Twelve (3:7-35), their Equipment with "the Mystery of the Kingdom" (4:1-34) and the Power of Faith (4:35-6:6), to their Mission (6:7-13). This development extends to Jesus' Departure from Galilee (6:14-52); the material itself consists merely of groups of anecdotes, the "pericopen" of recent criticism,[3] the homilies "adapted to (religious)

[3] A good summary of critical results will be found in *Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition,* by R. Bultmann, 1921. See also K. L. Schmidt, *Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu,* 1914.

needs" of second-century tradition. In these groups such motives as The Authority of Jesus, The Wonder-working Power of Faith, The Leaven of the Kingdom, Triumph over the Powers of Darkness, are easily seen to be dominant. They completely overtop such data of time and place as were at the evangelist's command, fully justifying the ancient admission regarding Mark's lack of "order."

A survey such as the above also reveals the fact that whether the term be correctly employed by us or not, the catechetic "groups" of Mk. 1-6 constitute in reality a "teaching of baptisms." The opening account of Jesus' baptism, which serves as prologue to the Gospel as a whole (1:1-11), describes in typical form Jesus' experience of the Adoption of the Spirit. Its terms are clearly intended to show Jesus as the "Servant" of Isaiah, but they are also adapted to instruct the neophyte in the full import of the rite which he himself is to undergo. He himself is to share this Adoption. He himself is to be endowed with these "powers of the age to come." Mark obscures, abbreviates, externalizes the story of the Temptations (ver. 12f), but the story in its fuller (Q) form is manifestly a lesson of Faith, whereby the Son of God (an example to every son of God) overcomes every fiery dart of the Evil One. Wisdom of Solomon has similar lessons. The humble dependence of faith for daily bread is taught

from Dt. 8:3 by the example of Israel in the wilderness.[4] The Fearlessness of Faith is taught by the "Song of Contingencies," the Proselytes' Psalm (Ps. 91). Jesus had refused to seek the aid of "legions of angels" when fronting the cross. He did better than Israel, who at Massah refused to proceed without a sign, tempting Jehovah their God. Jesus in fact had put Satan behind him when, setting his face toward Calvary, he refused a throne like David's, rejecting "the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." These are the intrinsic motives of the Temptation Story.

The omission of the teaching element from Mark's version of it, with retention only of the external data, is typical of the Roman evangelist. It characterizes his entire use of the Teaching Source. Nevertheless, even in Mark one can see that the story of Jesus' Baptism and Temptation had for its catechetic motive a teaching of Christian "faith" and the meaning of "the baptism of the Spirit." In fact, a saying of Jesus concerning "baptism in the Spirit" is conflated by Mark with the reading of his source (Mk. 1:8=Acts 1:5; 11:16, plus Q Mt. 3:12=Lk. 3:13) to produce a substitute for the original. In his source the contrast had been between the Baptist's symbol of repentance, the baptism of

[4] Compare Sap. 16:26. With the teaching of fearlessness cf. Sap. 2:13-3:9.

water, and the baptism of fire prepared for the unrepentant. In Mk. 1:8, John is made to tell his disciples of a "baptism of the Spirit" which is to supersede his own.

The allusion to the gift of Pentecost in Mk. 1:8 is unmistakable. But it is no less clear that the materials with which this evangelist sets forth his account of the Galilean ministry exhibit this "faith," and these "gifts of the Spirit," in contrast with Judaism. The inward, divine, and eternal appears in them over against "teachings of men." Jewish ceremonial lustrations are "baptisms of cups and pots and brazen vessels." True purity is inward (7:1-23). Jesus as "Son of Man" has an authority superior to Mosaic institutions. He can justify or condemn. The power of God is with him to heal and deliver from the bondage of Satan.

These early elements of Christian religious teaching are far clearer, as we shall see, in the Teaching Source (Q) than in the externalizing narrative of Mark. But even in the "spiritual Gospel" of Ephesus they still maintain their place. In Jn. 1:1-2:11, the story opens with a description of the baptism of John (not a "baptism of repentance unto remission of sins," but intended only to bear witness to him "that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit"), offset by the coming of John's disciples to "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Jesus

manifests his glory, cementing the faith of his followers by a "beginning of miracles" very different from Mark's. In the Johannine, Jesus sets over against the water of "the Jews' purifications" the wine of his own gospel. In Jerusalem he utters the great saying on the new temple, and expounds to Nicodemus the doctrines of new birth by water and the Spirit and justification by faith. Our Ephesian evangelist concludes this first period of Judean ministry by again contrasting the baptism of John with that of Jesus (3:22-36). He interjects after it a Samaritan ministry whose central discourse carries further the abolition of local worship in favor of universal access to the Father through the Spirit. The starting-point is a contrast of the water of Jacob's well with the "living water" which is the gift of the Christ, the gift of the Spirit. The doctrines here introduced are undeniably Pauline, as when Nicodemus must be taught the doctrine of justification by faith (3:14f.) and of the cross as the token by which God "commendeth his love toward us" (3:16-18); but the basis, even in John, is still unmistakably a "teaching of baptisms," Jewish baptisms, Johannine, Christian.

The next section of John has two opening faith-wonders and a discourse against "the Jews" on the Authority of the Son of Man to set aside the institutions of Mosaism (4:43-5:47). It presents a sub-

stantial parallel to the section of Mark on the growth of Opposition (Mk. 1:40-3:6) and that of the Teaching Source (Q) on the Stumbling of Israel (Mt. 11:2-12:45=Lk. 7:2-50; 11:14-36). After it the Galilean ministry concludes, as in the other Gospels, with the Miracle of the Loaves and an accompanying discourse (chapter 6). As we shall see later, the real basis of this primitive group, reflected in all the Gospels, is a teaching of Jesus' endowment with the Spirit constituting him the Isaian Servant who frees the captives (of Satan), opens blind eyes and deaf ears, and restores the dead (nation) to life. It has thus a direct connection with the account of the Baptism and Gift of the Spirit. The religious motif of "faith" was dominant. The "works" of the Servant were adduced with reference to this.[5]

If then, we go back to the beginnings of gospel tradition, whether it be by way of the Synoptic sources of reputed Petrine origin, or by way of the Ephesian evangelist who clearly embodies the more spiritual doctrine of Paul, in either case we come to elements which can best be described as "teachings of baptisms," teachings which contrast the baptism practised by the Church as embodying the essential

[5] The contemporary Prayer, or Blessing of Jehovah for his "power" shown in "sending a Redeemer" to his people in the bondage of death is expressed in similar adaptation of Isaian metaphor. It is known as the second of the *Shemoneh Esreh,* or "Eighteen Blessings." See p. 312 f and 393.

message of Jesus, (a) with "baptisms" (ablutions) of the Jews, (b) with the baptism of John "in water unto repentance" over against the coming baptism of fire. The true baptism had been for Jesus both a baptism of the Spirit and a baptism of blood; but to all those who are "of faith" it was a "seal" of the promise of the Father, witnessing that God is true, that He does not break his word of promised redemption.

And if the structural material from which our evangelists have framed their simple outline of the Galilean ministry proves to consist of just such groups of anecdotes told for the instruction of neophytes, if we find in this earlier half of the Gospels first principles of Christ, such as repentance from dead works and faith toward God, "even the teaching of baptisms and of laying on of hands (to symbolize impartation of the Spirit), and of resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment," should not analogy with the latter half, as already described, lead us to expect precisely this result? Paul gives us the origin of gospel accounts of the Judean ministry when he refers to the practice of the Church in his time to "tell the story" (καταγγέλλειν) of the Lord's death at the communion-table, just as adepts of the mysteries told the sacred legend (ἱερος λόγος) of the "savior god" in their assemblies, and Jews at the Passover recited the *haggada* of the redemption out

of Egypt. The story included at least, even in Paul's time, a full account of the tragedy in Jerusalem, for Paul in the same context refers the Corinthians to "the night in which the Lord was betrayed" as to a well-known occurrence. "Telling the story" would inevitably require the preliminary explanation of how and why Jesus had set his face to go up to this martyr fate, and through what steps it had been incurred. Having before our eyes the Passover story of "the first redemption" embodied in narrative form in the Pentateuchal epos and in lyric form in Hebrew poetry, it should be easy, even without the example of Greek religious myth and drama, to understand how the story of Calvary took first oral, then written form among the churches.

And if proper celebration of the Supper required a telling of its story, celebration of Baptism surely required even more extended instruction of the neophyte. Our part, as inquirers into the development of the Apostolic Message in its varied forms, is simply to study the elemental groups of Gospel material, distinguishing their intrinsic religious values from the biographic connection our extant evangelists have imposed upon them, in the endeavor to provide post-apostolic generations with some ordered account of Jesus' career.

Everywhere, in Petrine as well as Pauline teaching, a Servant Christology is presupposed. One cannot

imagine the great Apostle to the Gentiles offering to the Greco-Roman world, as a religion superior to that of its Epicurean and Stoic teachers, the Son-of-David gospel of the Jewish-Christian church. Jesus returning as a Son of Man on the clouds of heaven to receive the heathen for his inheritance, the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, to rule over the rebellious with a scepter of iron and "dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel," was not a prospect to make the missionary's message effective. The elements which stand out with such prominence from the pages of the Apocalypse of John can hardly have received the same interpretation or emphasis in the preaching of Paul. The Son-of-Man doctrine which Paul *as joint author with the "prophet" Silvanus* sets forth to the Thessalonians on the basis of "a word of the Lord" (probably conveyed through "prophets") doubtless represents Paul's furthest reach into the field of apocalyptic eschatology. But the message of Jesus had other and worthier embodiments. We have seen that Paul's conversion was due on its human, explicable side to the primitive doctrine of the Spirit. Paul found in the gift of the Spirit the power of God unto salvation. Because of this the cross became to him a token of the forgiving love of God restoring a sinful world to his favor. It is this aspect of Christianity as life in the Spirit which we find dominant in Paul's letters.

Certainly, no other would have won the Gentile world. But, on the other hand, it is equally certain that Saul of Tarsus did not evolve this conception of the message from his own intensely hostile inner consciousness. It was represented more or less fully and systematically in those forms of Christianity with which the persecutor came in contact, else he never would have become a Christian. Much less would he have sought in the common apostolic gospel a message for the Gentile world. In short, we must look for something corresponding to both elements of Paul's system of Christian thought, his doctrine of life in the Spirit as well as his doctrine of justification by faith, in pre-Pauline Christianity. The fact that all the Gospels reflect the same fundamental division as the Pauline Epistles between a teaching of baptisms and a teaching of the cup, a doctrine of life in the Spirit associated with the Galilean activity of Jesus after God had "anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power," and a doctrine of justification through the grace of the risen Lord associated with his martyr fate in Jerusalem, is not due to the direct influence of Paul. The agreement goes back of both forms of teaching to something more fundamental. It was enshrined, as we have seen, by the primitive Church in its two ritual observances, twin pillars of the house of Christian faith which would have set at defiance the strength of a Samson had Paul in his

blindness sought to overthrow them, instead of gratefully leaning on them for support.

It is one of the curiosities of Synoptic story that in spite of its paramount interest in baptism as the initiatory rite for the convert, it leaves unexplained the origin of the Christian form of the observance. The Book of Acts informs us that the multitudes that believed at Peter's word were "baptized into the name of Jesus." The implication was, as we have seen, that they put themselves under the protection of Jesus, confessing their sins, acknowledging him as their risen Lord and Intercessor, and expecting forgiveness on his account. Luke also gives an elaborate account of the baptism of the Spirit which came upon the assembled Church at Pentecost in fulfilment not only of Old Testament prophecy, but of a twice-cited promise of Jesus. He is careful to explain that Christian baptism involves more than Johannine. But nowhere does Luke tell how the early believers came to adopt the observance of John. They received the promised baptism of the Spirit. Yes; but what of the baptism of water? How came that to be taken over? Were the Apostles themselves baptized? If so, when, why, by whom, and with what results? Did they, like later Christians, receive the Spirit in connection with their baptism? Or were they rebaptized, like the disciples in Ephesus, when the "gifts of the Spirit" failed to appear?

Little help indeed toward an answer can be derived from the Gospel of Matthew. A message at its close, so late of origin as to substitute the Trinitarian formula for the name of Jesus, which every other reference of the New Testament shows to have been actually employed in the rite, attaches to its commission of the Twelve a command thus to baptize (Mt. 28:19). We may welcome the implied testimony that baptism was *not* among the directions given by Jesus while in the flesh, but was received afterwards (in Galilee?) among teachings delivered by the mouth of "prophets" or otherwise in utterances of the Spirit to the Church. In this respect the report of the Palestinian Gospel has value; as regards the question *why* the Johnannine rite was deemed worthy to take the place it seems to have occupied from the very first for the new brotherhood, Matthew tells us nothing. We must answer this question, if at all, by the values which New Testament writers attach to the observance and the symbolism by which they interpret it. In our earliest records, this Christian adaptation of the Johannine rite of initiation is invariably associated with the "gifts of the Spirit." Does this fact furnish any clue to its historical origin?

We have just noted as a singular defect of Synoptic story that it has no real explanation of the origin of Christian baptism. Alongside of this must be placed a still more extraordinary omission, the dis-

appearance from the records of the Church (save for a few stray allusions) of the most vital element of all in the story of its own beginnings. Paul, in summarizing to the Corinthians that common apostolic testimony to the resurrection which he had proclaimed with all others, "whether it were I or they," sets down as the foundation-stone of the resurrection faith the statement that the risen Lord had "appeared to Cephas." Nothing else save this reawakening of Peter's faith can account for the position accorded to the chief Apostle in the primitive Church. If we except a single branch of the ancient Church, Peter appears to all as its very foundation, its leader in the fight against "the gates of Sheol." The exception will be considered later. Our present concern is with the rule. Unless it be reported with reference to actual fulfilment, we cannot account for the Lukan form of the "high-priestly prayer" of Jesus at the Supper, when, after predicting the "scattering" of the disciples, he adds:

> Simon, Simon, I have made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art turned again (hast repented) strengthen thy brethren.

Certainly, the "turning again" (repentance) of Peter marked the beginning of the new faith, the first inflowing wave of the flooding tide. Certainly, it can only have been Peter's rallying of the scattered band in Galilee which gave opportunity for that appearance

"to the Twelve" which Paul ranks immediately after it. There may be an element of fancy in the statement that Matthew, in adding to Mark's story of Jesus' walking on the sea in the night following the Miracle of the Loaves, aims to develop its symbolism. Elsewhere we have maintained that "the further traits that Peter asks to be bidden to walk with Jesus on the sea, attempts it, fails through lack of faith, is rescued by Jesus, the two coming then together to the disciples in the boat," who thereupon "worshipped Jesus, saying, 'Of a truth thou art the Son of God'" (Mt. 14:28-33), show that Matthew took the story of Mark "to symbolize that of Gethsemane, when Peter offered to share Jesus' martyrdom and quailed before the storm, but was restored by Jesus and became the 'stablisher' of his brethren." [6] Critics have yet to pronounce upon this theory. But there is no element of fancy whatever in the clear reference of Lk. 24:34 to an appearance of the Lord "to Simon" which had preceded all others, so that the returning pilgrims to Emmaus "found the eleven gathered together" convinced that the Lord was "risen indeed." Whether or not we find symbolism in the story of the walking on the sea as elaborated by Matthew, the positive statement of Paul that God had "energized in Peter unto an apostleship of the circumcision" (Gal. 2:8) and the definite allusion of

[6] *Beginnings of Gospel Story.* Note on Mk. 6:45-52, p. 83.

Luke as well as Paul (I Cor. 15:4) to the primal resurrection appearance of the Lord as that to Peter leave no possible room for doubt. This manifestation *was* the beginning of the Church's resurrection faith. The Church *did* rest upon Peter in this sense as its foundation rock.

And nevertheless, the story itself of the manifestation to Peter has utterly disappeared from the record! Luke alludes to it, but has canceled it from his narration, together with the entire story of the "scattering" of the flock. The Twelve remain together in Jesusalem. Matthew retains the flight to Galilee, as in Mark, but has no individual appearance of the Lord to Peter. He pieces out with generalities the broken ending of his source, but has lost even the faint trace of a special appearance to Peter, retained in Mark's account of the angel's message by the women: "Go, tell his disciples *and Peter*, He goeth before you into Galilee." Mark itself in its oldest text had already substituted for that original appearance "to Cephas, then (εἶτα) to the Twelve," of which Paul speaks, an appearance to Peter *and* the Twelve (or "those that were with him"), which probably survives in such later forms as the *Gospel according to Peter* and the Appendix to John (Jn. 21). As is well known, the ending of Mark which its own narrative implies (14:28; 16:7) has disappeared. Whether this disappearance is due to diffi-

culties found in the attempt to reconcile its discordances with other versions of the "turning again" or to causes unknown is for critics to determine. The fact remains that this foundation-stone of the apostolic resurrection gospel as known to Paul has disappeared.

We have one more singular datum of evidence to consider—the exception already noted. One branch of the Church refused to acknowledge the primacy of Peter as witness to the resurrection. The Ebionite *Gospel according to the Hebrews* claimed this honor for James, the brother of the Lord, locating the appearance in Jerusalem! As regards locality, notoriously the Gospel of Luke is equally at variance with Mark-Matthew. So is the Appendix to John (Jn. 21) with the body of the Ephesian Gospel. But denial of primacy to Peter is so strange a phenomenon among all canonical forms of the resurrection story that we might well be inclined to reject outright the whole narrative of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* were it not for the surprising fact that Paul himself gives it support.

Like other branches of the Church, the Jewish-Christian brotherhood in Jerusalem celebrated the resurrection by breaking fast on the appointed anniversary. Like other churches, that of the Hebrews had its Gospel, in which the sacred story of the manifestation thus commemorated was central. We owe

it primarily to the great scholar Orĭgen, secondarily to Jerome who borrows his material, that the resurrection story of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* has been preserved. The extract shows that it made the appearance to "James the Just" basic, connecting with it the rite of "breaking fast," and located the scene (as we should expect) in Jerusalem, where "the servant of the high priest" must be assumed as resident. The risen Lord visits first the victim of Peter's sword.

> Now when the Lord had given his winding-sheet (*sindonem*) to the servant of the high priest he went to James and appeared to him. For James had vowed that he would eat no bread from that hour in which he had drunk the cup of the Lord (probably a mistranslation of the Aramaic "he—that is, Jesus—had drunk his cup"), until he should see him rising from among those that sleep.

After this ætiology of the Fast the story proceeded to its parallel of the Petrine narrative of "breaking fast" as related in Lk. 24:41-43 and Jn. 21:12f. A command of the Lord to "Bring a table and bread" was followed by a description of Jesus' institution of the rite:

> He took the bread and blessed it and brake and gave to James the Just, and said to him: "My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from among those that sleep."

Divergences so wide between the fundamental beliefs of the Church enshrined in sacred narrative (the ἱερος λόγος of the ritual) and supported by imme-

morial observance cannot be accounted for by late, sectarian controversy. The *Gospel according to the Hebrews* as a mere document is not earlier, it is true, than about 100 A.D.; but it enshrines the belief and practice of the Jerusalem branch of the Church from much earlier days, and this testifies unmistakably to a form of Christianity which disputed the claim of Peter to be the rock-foundation of the faith, and had its own rival account of how the risen Lord "was known of them in the breaking of bread." It maintained that Jesus, after his resurrection had instituted through his "brother" James the Just the central commemorative rite which witnessed to his coming again as "the Son of Man." This is not robbing Peter to pay Paul, but robbing Peter to pay James. If we turn back again from this strange item of the evidence to the equally strange divergence of "Jerusalem" from "Galilean" forms of the resurrection story, and compare with both Paul's brief summary of the primeval apostolic report, we shall find additional data of significance.

Critics such as Harnack [7] have noted that Paul's summary has a twofold structure. He pauses after reporting the appearances to Peter, "then" to the Twelve, and "then" to the "five hundred brethren at once," to note that "the greater part of these remain

[7] *Preussische Akademie,* Philos.-Historische Klasse, 1922, pp. 62-80. "Die Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu," etc.

until now, but some are fallen asleep." Resuming, he repeats the principal verb "then he appeared" to report a new series. There had also been, *after* what we may designate the "Petrine" group of appearances, a new order of manifestations, first "to James," next to a group corresponding to "the Twelve" but (if Pauline usage be considered) quite distinct from them and much more numerous, "all the apostles," lastly to Paul himself.

As to geographical location Paul says nothing. The appearance to himself, of which in Gal. 2:8 he makes Peter's the prototype, we know to have been not far from Damascus. That to James has the evidence of the known opposition of Jesus' brethren during his Galilean ministry and the clear implication of the fragment from the *Ev. Hebr.* to show that it took place in Jerusalem. A similar location is most probable for an appearance to "all the apostles." But what of the earlier, "Petrine" group? According to the "Galilean" form of the resurrection tradition, there was a "scattering" of the Twelve to Galilee, and an admission so damaging to their good repute cannot possibly be a later invention. The later adaptation, as recognized by all critics, is the Lukan, which removes the disparity by eliminating the obnoxious trait. Luke omits the "scattering" of Mk. 14:27 and changes the angelic message of Mk. 16:7 from "He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him,

as he said unto you," to, "Remember how he spake unto you *when he was yet in Galilee*, saying The Son of Man must be delivered up . . . and the third day rise again." Paul's reference to a "scripture" regarding the *resurrection* to take place "on the third day" has therefore nothing to do with the date of the *manifestation* to Peter. This can only have been in Galilee at some later date, perhaps "after the days of unleavened bread were finished," where the *Gospel according to Peter* places it.[8]

A second-century fragment, probably derived from Clement's lost treatise on the Passover, informs us that Quartodecimans maintained that the "Scripture" on which Paul based this dating of the resurrection was the law of observance of First-fruits (Lev. 23:11ff.), which prescribed the lifting up to God of the first sheaf of wheat from the new harvest by the priest in the temple "on the morrow after the sabbath" of the Passover, that is, Nisan 16, the "third day" after the slaying of the paschal lamb. Paul's imagery, Christ "our Passover" slain on our account, buried and raised again "the third day" to become "the First-fruits of them that slept," lends color to

[8] *Ev. Petri* 14:58 "Now it was the last day of Unleavened Bread, and many were leaving and returning to their homes because the Feast was over. And we, the twelve Apostles of the Lord, were mourning and weeping; and each returned to his own home, lamenting over what had occurred. And I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother took our nets and went to the sea," etc.

this identification of the much debated "scripture." It is also possible, of course, that Paul had heard of the tradition of certain women of the apostolic company being early at the tomb on "the third day," finding it empty, and reporting a vision of angels. The visit to the tomb is probable in itself. Rites at the tomb in honor of the dead on the third day after burial (also on the seventh, ninth and *fortieth*) were an immemorial custom observed at this period throughout Syria. Jesus' friends (all who had not fled to Galilee) would have felt it an unpardonable impiety to neglect either his sepulture, or the commemorative rites at the tomb, the distinctive feature of which was "eating together." Observance of "the third day" cannot well be dissociated from this practice; for it is regularly linked with "eating together," and the tradition, early or late in origin, has manifestly the object of confirming both belief and observance. It makes the Sunday of First-fruits the resurrection, or Lord's day.

But the angels' message is not a "manifestation of the Lord." It only predicts one. And if Paul knew of the tradition of the tomb being found empty on "the third day," he ignores it. His belief in "the third day" is that on it Jesus had been lifted up to the right hand of God, "the First-fruits of them that slept." This belief is based on no earthly witness whatsoever, not even a visit to the sepulcher. It

rested solely on "Scripture" and (in the Jerusalem tradition) the word of an "angel." No doubt it was commemorated by observance; for the "first day of the week" is a day for the assembly of the churches even in Paul's time (I Cor. 16:2; Acts 20:7); but the only basis for this observance of "the third day" known to Paul is "scripture."

From Paul's mention of "the third day," accordingly, no inference can be drawn as to the date of the manifestation to Peter. Paul leaves us as much in the dark as respects this as in regard to the locality. But it has been acutely observed that while we might naturally look to Galilee as the region where it would be most practicable to gather an assembly of "above five hundred brethren" at this early date, Paul could not have known their subsequent history if they had remained resident in the scattered Galilean villages. Jerusalem is hardly the place in which we should expect "more than five hundred brethren" to assemble so shortly after Calvary; but to enable Paul to report that the greater part of them at the time of writing were still alive, they must have become attached very soon to that Jerusalem community with which Paul came in contact. They will have ranked among its "charter-members," holding a distinction like that of the Cypriote Mnason, also a resident of Jerusalem, the host of Paul during his stay

in the city, who in Acts 21:16 is called an "original" (ἀρχαῖος) disciple.

How are these seemingly contradictory implications to be reconciled? To the present writer, no other way seems open than to hold that a migration of the Galilean body to Jerusalem took place on initiative of "the Twelve" shortly after they themselves had received their "manifestation." Doubtless the chosen occasion would be that of ancient custom, the going up after grain harvest to the Feast of Pentecost, culmination of the seven weeks of thanksgiving and rejoicing. Restored faith in Jesus as returning Son of Man would dictate a retracing of the way in which they had followed him, leaving behind all earthly ties. Economic conditions as well as religious would dictate this season of the completed harvest as appropriate. The company would take the usual road down the Jordan valley, camping, no doubt, at the fords near Jericho before beginning the long, arduous ascent. They would rally here for another entry into the city so lately stained with the blood of the last and greatest of Jehovah's messengers. And here at the scene of the baptism of John, in these waters wherein Jesus had dedicated himself as one of those who would constitute the "people prepared for the Coming," they would be moved as a body animated by one common purpose to confession of sin,

rededication of themselves to the cause which had cost Jesus his life, and a glory of new hope in the assurances of those to whom God had already granted "manifestations" of the risen "Lord." It is on such an occasion as this, at the scene where Jesus (and doubtless many of Peter's company) had been "baptized of John in Jordan" that we can best conceive the members of the new brotherhood taking up as their own initiatory rite the ritual of John, giving it new significance by making it a consecration "into the name of Jesus," acknowledging him as "Lord," and experiencing those rapturous "gifts of the Spirit" which henceforth were to be distinctive of *Christian* baptism.

Two objections will be felt to any such attempt as this to account for the adoption of the rite: (1) it differs slightly as to date, and somewhat more as to locality, from the Lukan account of the baptism of the Spirit. (2) While avowedly based on Paul's reference to an "appearance" of the Lord following that to Peter and the subsequent appearance "to the Twelve," it has no more reference than the Lukan to any vision of the risen Christ. These objections are serious, and must be considered in order.

1. We have already seen that Synoptic tradition exhibits a deep gap between the two forms of the resurrection belief and observance, the Petrine, or Galilean, and the Jerusalem form, which puts for-

ward the leadership of James. So deep a rift implies that the very germ of Christianity itself was, so to speak, bi-nuclear. If any weight at all be attached to the belief and practice represented in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews,* there actually were two separate beginnings of the faith, doubtless not far apart in time; though we cannot question the explicit declaration of Paul that it was "after" (ἔπειτα) the series of "appearances" to Peter, the Twelve, and the five hundred that those "to James" and "to all the apostles" occurred. In Mark, followed by *Ev. Petri,* the episode of the women at the sepulcher is still completely disconnected from the experience of Peter and the Twelve. Only later, in Matthew, Luke, and the main body of John, is a very halting adjustment at last effected between the two. Obviously, the story of the sepulcher and the appearance to the women belongs to the traditions of Jerusalem, and played at first no part whatever in the Galilean. But since it was in Jerusalem, not in Galilee, that the Church grew up and attained reputation and a name, it was inevitable that as between the two rival forms of the tradition, the chief sufferer in the process of amalgamation would be the more primitive, or Petrine. This is conspicuous in the narrative of Luke, who, in spite of his general adoption of the Jerusalem tradition, retains incongruous elements from the Galilean form, such as the references

to Peter's "turning again," the manifestation "to Simon," and the story of an appearance to "the eleven" (seemingly in Galilee, since the viand for the breaking of the fast is "a piece of a broiled fish" as in Jn. 21:9ff.), when they are "terrified and affrighted," supposing they "had seen a spirit." Psychologically, this attitude of "the eleven" is irreconcilable with the representation of the context that but a few moments before the same group had greeted the report of the two from Emmaus with the glad assurance "the Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared unto Simon." Luke is attempting here an impracticable combination of Galilean with Jerusalem tradition.

It is the fact that the later, Jerusalem tradition has already so largely encroached upon the primitive Galilean in Synoptic story that makes the gospel record so difficult to harmonize with the summary of Paul. Doubtless Paul knew the story of James as well as that of Peter, though his sympathies could not fail to incline him toward the latter. Three years after his conversion he went up to Jerusalem "to make the acquaintance (ἱστορῆσαι) of Peter." He also saw "James the Lord's brother," though he clearly regards this as of minor importance. As we have seen, when he enumerates the "manifestations" he places first that "to Cephas," making it the prototype of his own (Gal. 2:8). The manifestations "to

James" and "to all the apostles" are not forgotten, but come after a digression. As regards the story of the women at the sepulcher, which plays so conspicuous a part in Jerusalem tradition, Paul, as we have seen, ignores it. He mentions the burial of Jesus because that is required by his parallel of the grain of wheat hid in the soil. But if he had ever heard the sepulcher story, he gives no sign of the fact, in spite of the reënforcement it would give to his doctrine of a "transfiguration" of the body of flesh into glory-substance. Of the Jerusalem tradition of the resurrection, Paul seems to admit nothing save the bare fact that "after" the Galilean appearances Jesus "was manifested to James, then to all the apostles." The relative value of the Jerusalem traditions reported by Luke must be judged by this. Moreover, it must be remembered that Luke, through his elimination of the "scattering" to Galilee, was compelled in all cases where he desired to retain elements of the Petrine tradition such as the appearance to "the eleven" (Lk. 24:36-43) to transfer the setting to Jerusalem.

2. The exigencies of his general preference for the Jerusalem tradition may have led Luke to make the slight transfer of scene of the manifestation to the five hundred from the Jordan to Jerusalem, and from the eve of Pentecost to Pentecost itself. But how are we to account for the apparent absence from

his account (if it really refers to the same occasion as the "manifestation" to the five hundred) of any clear statement of an "appearance of the Lord"?

Reference has been made above (p. 61), in speaking of the vision of Onias seen by Judas the Maccabee, to the difference between the ancient and the modern conception. To ancient writers generally, in particular to the biblical writers, "vision" is an opening of the inward or soul-sense to perceive what is really transpiring in the spirit-world, however imperceptible to bodily eye and ear. It is literally clairvoyance, clairaudience. Hence Elisha's terrified servant needs only the opening of his inward eye to perceive what is apparent to his master by prophetic clairvoyance. The hills encircling Samaria are "full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." The prophet thus proves to his servant that "they that are with us are more than they that are with the Syrians." Once this slow change in the meaning of language is appreciated, two difficulties of the interpreter of biblical accounts of vision are at once removed: (a) Simultaneous "vision" by any number of persons of the same "manifestation" no longer presents a difficulty. One, or three, or twelve, or five hundred need only to be made clairvoyant at the same time to perceive identical realities of the spirit world to which the ordinary observer is completely deaf and blind. (b) Not every individual of the group need

have identical psychological experiences or impressions. It suffices that all have some part in the general impression, so that their individual experience of clairvoyance or clairaudience may be referred to a common "spiritual" agency. One member of the group may have seen "as it were tongues of flame, and it sat upon each one of them." Another may have heard "the sound of a rushing mighty wind." A third may have seen "the appearance of a fire in Jordan," as an ancient uncanonical gospel reports concerning the baptism of Jesus. Still another may have had such "visions and revelations of the Lord" as Paul describes in his own case and that of other apostles and prophets, and as the Seer of Patmos describes in Rev. 1:9-18. Paul does not mean that all the five hundred had an identical experience, but that the simultaneous experiences of all the group were referable to a common cause. It was not expected that in group manifestations all would have precisely the same experience, but diverse experiences were referred to the working of "one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally as He will" (I Cor. 12:11). The "gift of the Spirit" was a direct impartation to each from the one glorified Lord. Not all need have the vision of the Lord himself, as he had "appeared to Cephas, after that to the Twelve," but whatever each had received confirmed the original manifestation. If the common cause could be

found only in the direct action of the risen Lord, his presence could be witnessed by all. In this sense "above five hundred at once" could receive a "manifestation of the Lord." Descriptions of the experience by later reporters would differ according to the special item of clairaudience or clairvoyance to which special interest was directed. The point to be proved was that it was no other than the risen Lord in whose name the company were gathered, who had "poured forth" what all could "see and hear."

The differences between Paul's report of the manifestation to the five hundred and the Jerusalem tradition of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit are capable, in the present writer's judgment, of explanation along these lines. Luke, in recording the later version of the baptism of the Spirit, locating it in Jerusalem and making of it a parallel to the revelation of the Law at Horeb, delivered, according to Jewish tradition, in seventy languages at once, a stream of fire issuing from the top of the mount and dividing into the various speeches of the world "as sparks fly from the anvil" (cf. Dt. 33:2), simply depicts the Jerusalem brotherhood as commissioned, together with its "apostles," to the conversion of the world. This is the assumption of the preceding chapter (Acts 1:8). But, as we very well know, it carries back to the beginning conceptions of the universality

of the Church's mission, which in reality were but slowly arrived at and through bitter controversy. The apostleship of Peter of which Paul speaks was not at first understood to include the Gentiles. It was "an apostleship of the circumcision." Its bearers were a chosen Twelve who expected to be judges "over the twelve tribes of Israel," who perhaps even cherished as a command of Jesus that they were *not* to go "into any way of the Gentiles." If, then, the "baptism of the Spirit" is to be carried back to the very beginnings (and this is imperative), we must think of the circumstances attending it not according to the world-outlook of the late Jerusalem tradition which has appealed to the imagination of Luke, paralleling the mission of the Church to that of Israel in the revelation at Sinai, but according to the simpler conceptions implied in what remains of the testimony of Peter and Paul. Luke has embodied something of these by making Jerusalem the spiritual heir of Galilee; but Paul is our witness that it was not the tradition of James which was *first*, but that of Peter. It is to the experience of Peter that we must look for the significance of baptism as a primitive embodiment of the Apostolic message.

We have already observed that Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith, or, in simpler language, forgiveness for Jesus' sake, is avowedly based on a

gospel already current before his conversion, of which "the Scriptures," more especially the doctrine of the vicarious suffering of the Isaian Servant, formed the basis. Paul does not create the doctrine, he assumes it. He does not quote Is. 52:13-53:12 in support of the doctrine, he only allows it to shine through his utterances about the one whom God "highly exalted," because he had "taken on him the form of a servant" (δοῦλος), and become "obedient unto death" (cf. Is. 52:13; 53:11, LXX εὖ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς, 8, 12) or about God's "delivering him up for our trespasses, and raising him for our justification" (cf. Is. 53:11f.) while we were "weak" and "sinners" (cf. Is. 53:5, 10), or finally about his "distributing the spoil of the mighty ones" (cf. Is. 53:12 LXX). Paul does not use the actual title "the Servant" like some primitive documents specially connected with the name of Peter or prayers connected with the sacrament of the Cup. He merely speaks of the "meekness and lowliness" of Christ as the salient characteristics of the Lord, and uses the portrait of the Servant as his model for that of Jesus. But Paul explicitly looks back to an apostleship of Peter earlier than his own. This was "an apostleship of the circumcision." Peter's associates in it were "the Twelve," and in it the central figure was the exalted Servant. It held "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," and that he had been raised again the third

day to "make intercession for transgressors." Those who accepted this gospel in faith, confessing Jesus as "Lord," were made members of the brotherhood by a baptism which was distinguished from John's by the gift of the Spirit.

CHAPTER V.

THE GIFT OF THE SPIRIT IN "JAMES"

THE late date of I Peter, a writing of encouragement to the Pauline churches of Asia Minor under persecution almost certainly later than the Neronic, is a serious, if not fatal, obstacle to regard it as Petrine in any immediate sense. The writer seeks to convey what he might call the "message" of Peter for this great occasion. He delivers it in very Pauline terms; but with the aid of Paul's own testimony, we can form a reasonably accurate idea of the apostolic message of Peter.

The evidence in support of "the so-called Epistle of James" (so it is designated by Origen) is far weaker than that for I Peter, and against its claims to authenticity a similar verdict must be pronounced in even stronger terms. In the opening paragraphs the writer seems to be using the metaphors of I Pt. 1:25 concerning the churches as a new Diaspora, whose faith is being "proved" in manifold trials (though he swerves from this sense of the word to that of "temptations" in verses 13ff.). Christianity is a "sowing" of God, exposed to scorching winds, but saved by en-

durance in the implanted word. Because of this apparent dependence on I Peter, and for many other reasons, modern criticism regards the ascription to James as unfounded.[1] Nevertheless, the testimony of "James" is far from valueless. The writer was certainly not an ignorant man. His work cannot be later than the early years of the second century, and he is attempting to speak for the Jerusalem "bishop of bishops." His judgment of the message of James for the Church of his generation naturally lacks historical perspective. But the conception of the generation following the actual James is worth having. We must expect a certain idealization; but the type of doctrine here presented is by no means colorless. It is distinctive, if only by its vigorous rejection of the great watchword of Paul: "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith alone." The author of the Epistle of James is probably not waging a conscious polemic against the great Apostle to the Gentiles. He attacks a perversion of Paulinism such as Paul himself had occasion to rebuke. But he is certainly not a Paulinist. He belongs to the school of the Wisdom writers such as Sirach. He echoes the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. If he fails to see that he is contradicting Paul, this very fact is

[1] See especially J. H. Ropes, *International Critical Commentary*, 1916. With characteristic caution Ropes refuses to regard the relation of James to "Peter" as proving more than origin in a common milieu of Christian teaching. He dates the writing on other grounds in "75-125 A. D.," after the death of James.

the best possible proof of the independent derivation of his type of Christian teaching.

In spite of his apparent employment of I Peter, the writer of "James" stands almost at the antipodes from it in type of doctrine. "Peter" writes for the specific purpose of commending the example of the Crucified. His supreme type of patience in suffering is the Servant of Isaiah, "who suffered for you, leaving you an example that ye should follow in his steps." Jesus' patience, meekness, and gentleness under unmerited suffering form the heart of his message. "James" has another pattern. He would have his brethren "Take for an example of suffering and of patience the prophets who spake in the name of the Lord." He commends especially "the patience of Job." Jesus is never mentioned, save in the superscription: "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," and in the expression "the faith of the Lord of glory," to which in 2:1 the writer himself or some later hand has attached the name "Jesus Christ." [2] The absence of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity as commonly understood is so conspicuous that two critics of repute have denied that the substance of the work is Christian at all. They would regard the Epistle as a Synagogue homily adapted to the Church's use. Such a judgment is extreme, not really reconcilable with the character

[2] See Ropes *ad loc.*

of the writing, nor the history of its transmission; but the fact that it could be seriously advanced and defended shows how far the Epistle stands from the type of gospel to which we are accustomed, whether Petrine or Pauline in derivation.

Has "James" then any "gospel" at all save his neolegalism? Yes; he has a teaching of baptisms, a doctrine of the Spirit. His object is "the righteousness of God," and he looks forward to a day of the Lord's Coming, not far off but "at hand," in which the rich and proud and oppressors of the poor will meet their doom, while the prayers of patient believers will be rewarded. Salvation in this "day of slaughter" will be won by obedience to the law. And by the Law he does not mean the Mosaic only, but a "royal law," a "perfect law of liberty," a law of love, which is the inward mirror of the soul. "Good works" are the necessary complement of "faith" (by "faith" the writer understands loyal acceptance of the doctrine of the Unity, 2:19), and by these fruits of faith adherents such as Rahab are justified. They are not saved by mere adhesion to the elect people through adoption of its creed. They must have "works" also. But can this be called a Christian "gospel"? What does "James" teach that is not mere liberal Judaism of the type exhibited by the Wisdom writers? Wherein does his doctrine of salvation differ from the Lukan of Acts 10:35?

"James" has one doctrine which transcends his neolegalism and gives him the right to call his message a "gospel." We do not refer to his definition of "religion" (1:27). What "James" presents as "religion" in contrasting "doers of the word" with mere "hearers" who go away from the "synagogue" (so he designates the Christian assembly) and forget the ideal set before them, is scarcely a "gospel." Purity from the world, bridling the tongue, kindness to the widows and fatherless constitute "worship" (θρησκεία) acceptable to God. What we mean by "religion" as distinct from mere morality appears neither in "James' " doctrine of good works nor his doctrine of acceptable worship, but in his doctrine of "the wisdom that cometh from above." This is his real "gospel." While it is not called by this name it is in reality "the gift of the Spirit," not "tongues" and "miracles" and ecstasies, as in Acts, manifestations adapted to the apprehension of "unbelievers" who come to stare at disorderly assemblies such as those in Corinth, but a divine potency effecting moral transformation, as in Paul. Moreover, this heavenly gift of "wisdom from above," given by God for the asking, is identical in its characteristics with what Paul calls "the Spirit of Jesus." It manifests itself in "meekness" and a "good life." It is far from factiousness and jealousy. It is "first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and

good fruits." If one will observe what Paul enumerates as the "fruits of the Spirit," and what he regards as distinctive of "love," the root of all gifts of the Spirit, without which they are "nothing," the resemblance will appear something more than can be accounted for by accident.

How comes it, then, that for "James" this "good and perfect gift, coming down from the Father of the lights (of heaven)" to produce a harvest in man, so that the redeemed become a kind of first-fruits of the creation, is spoken of not as "the Spirit," still less "the spirit of Jesus," but as an "implanted word," a heavenly "law," a "wisdom" of God which produces the "fruit of righteousness (or justification)" when sown in peace for them that make peace? In addition to the suggestion taken apparently from I Peter, we must go to Jewish and Hellenistic sources for the answer.

In the Epistle of James the word "wisdom" (σοφία) alternates with "law" (νόμος) to signify that redeeming power which descends from the Father of the lights and fructifies in the souls of men. This is that "living and abiding" "word of God" of which Isaiah had spoken (Is. 40:6ff.), and which "Peter" had identified with "the word of good tidings" proclaimed to the Christian Diaspora ("dispersion," "sowing"). If a man receives with meekness this "implanted word" (λόγος), he forms part of God's

harvest, a kind of first-fruits of his creation. By an act of his own gracious will, God thus may be said to have "brought us forth" (ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς).[3] If one become not only a hearer but a doer of this "word," it becomes for him an inward mirror of the soul, a royal law (for he is the son of a great King), a perfect law, and yet a "law of liberty," which "worketh the righteousness of God." These are classic terms of Synagogue teaching, whether in rabbinic or Hellenistic development.

To the rabbis, the term Torah ("law," more literally "teaching"), like the Greek Logos, of which it was sometimes made the equivalent, had a two-fold significance, an inward and an external sense. The Greek has but a single term for inward thought and outward expression. The outward symbol, written or spoken, is a mere vehicle by which one passes back to the invisible, inaudible thought which gave it perceptible form. To read is to "re-cognize" (ἀναγινώσκειν), that is, to translate the written symbol back into the invisible thought from which it sprang. So, too, with the spoken word. It merely conveys through the sense of hearing the same thought which through written characters is conveyed by way of the eye. More than this. Actions may speak

[3] Cf. Jn. 1:13. But "James" significantly avoids the term "*begotten* of God." He chooses in preference a figure appropriate to the (feminine) agency, Wisdom (σοφία). We are indeed "children of God," but more specifically "Wisdom's children" (Lk. 7:35).

louder than words. Man lives in an ordered creation adapted to intelligible purposes, not a mere unintelligible chaos. Creation, too, then, must be an expression of mind. There is a "logic" of the world-drama, to which the human intelligence is irresistibly impelled to apply itself. Hence the Stoic distinction between reason ("word") expressed and reason unexpressed. The λόγος ἐνδιάθετος (reason latent) and the λόγος προφορικός (reason in activity) are the two aspects under which the world must be viewed. Jewish thought during the period of the sages, when it came under Greek influence, adapted this terminology to its own uses. For the rational principle underlying the universe (νοῦς or λόγος) it substituted the "wisdom" (*hoqmah*=σοφία) of God. In the Wisdom literature of Alexandria down to the time of Philo, who formally adopts the Stoic term, "wisdom" is the regular Jewish expression for the creative, revealing, and redemptive principle of the divine nature. Especially is it conceived as morally redemptive in accordance with the religious emphasis of Jewish thought. The Wisdom of God goes out to seek and to save the lost. As in the exquisite poem of Prov. 8-9, she is personified as the redeeming Spirit of a Father pleading with wayward sons. Israel, the people of revelation, is the nation with which she has made her abode. The temple is her shrine; the Shekinah ("dwelling"), outwardly manifest in the pillar of fire

and cloud, overshadows her abode, from which she will not be driven unless by the disobedience and faithlessness of the nation. It is in pursuance of the national election, the mission of Israel to give to the world knowledge of the true God, that this revelation takes place; and it is not only a national prerogative to be thus "intrusted with the oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2), but Wisdom becomes incarnate in individual leaders. Speaking of Abraham, Moses and the prophets, Wisdom of Solomon declares "In every generation entering into holy souls she maketh men to be prophets and friends of God."

There is also habitually a note of warning. The people's disobedience to God's messengers may lead Wisdom to forsake her "house." [4] But when Israel at last receives them with blessings and hosannahs as "coming in the name of Jehovah," instead of with stoning and insult, she will return to her dwelling in the temple. In Messiah's reign this mission of Israel will be accomplished, for then "wisdom will be poured out like water":

Because the Elect One standeth before the Lord of spirits,
And his glory is forever and ever,
And his might unto all generations.
And in him dwells the spirit of wisdom,
And the spirit of Him who gives knowledge,

[4] See Epistle of Clement (95 A. D.) lvii. quoting "All-virtuous Wisdom," (that is, the Spirit which is the source of all the virtues) in the extract Prov. 1:23-33. Hegesippus (*ap. Euseb. H. E.* II, xxiii. 15 applies similarly part of the same passage, combining it with Sap. 2:12.

And the spirit of understanding and of might,
And the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness.[5]

To the Rabbis, Wisdom and the Torah are of course equivalent. Whether the statements to this effect be part of the original poems, or Palestinian additions, this equivalence is constantly attached to the utterance of lyric Wisdom in such hymns as Ecclus. 24 and Baruch 3:1-4:4. The reader is not permitted to forget that

All these things (spoken by Wisdom in praise of herself) are the Book of the Covenant of the Most High God,
Even the Law which Moses commanded us for a heritage.

Even when he reads of God's revealing "all the way of knowledge" and giving it (as Isaiah had said) "unto Jacob his Servant, and to Israel that is beloved of him," so that, after this, Wisdom "appeared upon earth and was conversant with men" (Bar. 3:36f.), he must be reminded that

This is the book of the commandments of God,
And the Law that endureth forever.

Naturally, there were biblicists among the Rabbis, men who drowned the spirit under the letter, refusing to distinguish the written page from the divine message contained in it. Possibly extravagant utterances of theirs may be cited which even surpass those of the post-Reformation dogmatists of relatively modern

[5] *Ethiopic Enoch*, XLIX, 1.

times, especially if the poetic paradoxes of Jewish midrash be interpreted with bald, uncomprehending literalness. But there were not wanting also the spiritually minded, who distinguished as Paul does between letter and spirit, as the Reformers did, between the book and the divine revelation it "contained." These looked upon the written page only as a vehicle of "the love and truth of God." To these the Torah meant literally the "teaching" of God. Behind the letter, a mere symbol, was the eternal Spirit, redemptive Wisdom, healing, restoring, winning back by mercy and love the wayward souls of men. The writer of James belongs to Judaism of this type, nearer to Paul in its doctrine of the Spirit (in spite of its polemic against a Pauline phrase) than the Petrine tradition of Luke. The Christianity of "James" is expressed in the lines of F. A. Rollo-Russell:

> Come, then, Law divine, and reign,
> Freest faith assailed in vain,
> Perfect love, bereft of fear,
> Born in heaven, and radiant here.

For the relation of James to Judaism the vital point is that the Torah to the Rabbis has this twofold sense. It is not merely the Law and the prophets, but the revealing, redemptive Spirit which gave them. It is not mere teaching, but the divinely given spirit of obedience to hearken to the teaching, a meek and loving spirit which yearns over men with notes of

gentle persuasion like the cooing of a dove. As the Pharisean writing known as *Little Genesis*, or the *Book of Jubilees*, has it in the divine answer to Moses' prayer of intercession (i. 22-25):

> I know their rebelliousness and their evil disposition and their stiff-neckedness, and they will not hearken until they acknowledge their own sins and the sins of their fathers. And thereafter they will return to me in all uprightness with their whole heart and their whole soul, and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of their children's heart, *and will create in them a holy spirit and make them clean*, so that from that day they will turn away from me no more forever. And their soul will follow after me and after my whole commandment, and they will do according to my commandment, and I will be their Father and they shall be my children. And they shall all be called children of the living God, and every angel and spirit shall know it, and shall acknowledge that they are my children and I their Father in truth and righteousness, and that I love them.

For the Pharisees, this promised outpouring of the Spirit is naturally a spirit of obedience to the commandment. For the Sages, it had been the spirit of Wisdom; for the prophets, the spirit of prophecy (cf. Acts 2:16-21 quoting Joel 2:28ff.). For the scribes, it was the spirit of the Torah, "the Torah as the sum total of the contents of revelation, without special regard to any particular element in it, the Torah as a faith," to use the definition of Schechter in his chapter on "The Law as Personified in the Literature" (Chapter IX of *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*):

It is the Torah in this abstract sense, as a revelation and a promise, the expression of the will of God, which is identified with the Wisdom of Prov. 8, thus gaining, in the course of history, a pre-mundane existence, which, so to speak, formed the design according to which God mapped out the world.

But we are less concerned with the divine principle of creation than with that of revelation, the Torah as given at Sinai. As to this Schechter continues:

The day of revelation is considered as the day on which earth is wedded to heaven. The barrier between them was removed by the fact that the Torah, the heavenly bride, the daughter of the Holy One, was wedded to Israel on that day. The simile is carried further, and even the feature of the capture of the bride is not missing,—the verse in Ps. 68:19 "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive" being interpreted as referring to Moses, who ascended to heaven and captured the Torah, in spite of the resistance of the angels, who were most reluctant to allow the Torah, the desirable treasure, to be taken away from among them.

The quotations are of course taken from what Abrahams well calls "the poetry of the Talmud," and it is not alone in the Midrash on Exodus that we find it carried out, but also (quite naturally) in that on the Songs of Songs, which was interpreted as the wedding song of this marriage of the Torah. Here we are again told of Moses ascending to heaven to obtain forgiveness for the people and thus remove "blackness" (Cant. 1:5) from the face of the bride.

It should also be observed that in the New Testa-

ment, as in the Talmud, the angels are regarded as interposing to protest against what they regard as the undue mercy of God (cf. Rom. 8:33-39). Their attitude is consistently represented as that of jealousy.

In view of the parallel in Eph. 4:7-10, where Paul calls the gift of the Spirit "the gift of Christ," denying that it was Moses who ascended on high to obtain it, but he who had previously descended (from heaven) to the (these) lower parts of earth, Schechter might well have continued the quotation from the Psalm; for the whole point of argument on both sides lies in the clause "and gave gifts unto men." Paul follows the curious reading of the Targum, which by transposition of two letters (the emendation known as *temurah*) reads *halaq*, "distributed as spoil," in place of *laqah*, "received." It is the same unusual word which is used of the suffering Servant in Is. 53:12, where it is promised that he shall "distribute the spoil (*halaq*) with (LXX "of") the strong" or "the mighty ones." It is doubtless through a combination of the two passages that Paul reaches the conception of Christ through the cross "spoiling the (angelic) principalities and powers" (Col. 2:15), as he leads captive their captivity in his triumphal march (II Cor. 2:14; Col. 2:15),[6] and bestows on his followers the gifts of the Spirit.

[6] On the liberation of Satan's captives as one of the works of the Servant (Is. 49:24-26) see below, p. 293.

But we must return to Schechter for an exposition of the rabbinic conception of the Torah as the light of divine revelation which Israel has received in trust; for Israel is God's Servant, elected to make the revelation known to the world.

Thus Mount Sinai becomes the place in which God reveals himself to the world, and Israel undertakes the terrible responsibility of bearing witness to this fact. "If you will not make known my divinity (divine nature) to the nations of the world even at the cost of your lives, you shall suffer for this iniquity," said God. Though indeed the whole of creation has the duty to join in his praise and to bear witness to his divinity (divine power), Israel is especially commanded to invite all mankind to serve God and to believe (have faith) in him, even as Abraham did, who made God beloved by all the creatures. And so intensely should we love him that we should also make others love him. For those who make God beloved by mankind are much greater than the mere lovers.

Here the reader of the New Testament is reminded of the closing words of the Epistle of James on the conversion of sinners (Jas. 5:19f.). But we continue. The Rabbis, according to Schechter, had also a doctrine of the restoration of a morally ruined world to order and peace:

By this acceptance of the Torah, Israel made peace between God and his world, the ultimate end being that its influence will reach the heathen too, and all the gentiles will one day be converted to the worship of God; for the Torah "is not the Torah of the Priests, nor the Torah of the Levites, nor the Torah of the Israelites, but the Torah of Man (Torath ha-Adam), whose gates are open to re-

ceive the righteous nation which keepeth the truth and those who are good and upright in their hearts."

We are told that Paul was the pupil of Gamaliel, and Gamaliel was the great liberal among the Rabbis of Paul's time. When we try to conceive in what way Paul before his conversion to Christianity would have looked upon Israel's mission to the Gentile world which he so well knew, it may be well to remember some such utterances as these concerning the Torah as a revelation not for the aggrandizement of priest or Levite, or even of Israel, but for the "reconciliation" (*ritsui*) of a rebellious world.

For, finally, we have to recall again that the Torah meant all that the human mind has received or can receive of the knowledge of the goodness and love of God; moreover, it meant not the knowledge of him only, but the *yetser ha-tob,* the spirit and disposition to obey him.

For the Torah came down from heaven with all the necessary instruments (for winning the world): humility, righteousness, and uprightness—and even her reward was in her. And man has only to apply these tools to find in the Torah peace, strength, light, bliss, happiness, joy, and freedom.

We have quoted somewhat at length from Schechter's chapter on "The Law as Personified in the Literature" to show the relation of Paul's doctrine of Life in the Spirit to such teachings as must have been familiar to him in his pre-Christian days. We omit

detailed reference to the Talmudic sources, because these are scattered, difficult of access, still more difficult to interpret, and most of all difficult to date. Fortunately, Philo and the Wisdom writers who preceded him are demonstrably pre-Christian; also such writings as *Enoch* and *Jubilees* from which we have quoted. From these it is easily apparent that Hellenistic mysticism had found its way to the very heart of rabbinic Judaism long before the Christian era. Hence it is superfluous to show that such conceptions as we meet in Ephesians and Colossians of the ascent of Christ to heaven, when he "spoiled the principalities and powers" and "gave gifts unto men" were not pure novelties, creations of Paul's own fanciful interpretation of the psalmist's "battle-song of Jehovah." They were accepted Jewish interpretations embodying vital religious ideas, in this case nothing less than the promised "gift of the Spirit." Indeed the very form of Paul's quotation of the Psalm, insisting that it shall have the application he gives rather than some other, shows clearly that the application to Moses, as in the Targum, was already current. This might perhaps be inferred also from the great antithesis of II Cor. 3:1-4:6 in which Paul contrasts the new covenant promised by Jeremiah, assured to him and to his fellow-ambassadors of the resurrection faith by their inward experience, with the interces-

sion of Moses on Sinai, his fading transfiguration, and the bringing down of the Torah.

But there is more conclusive evidence than any thus far cited, and at the same time clearer proof of the fundamental identity of these two seemingly diverse ideas of Christ as Spirit and Law, the Wisdom of God and his redeeming power, in the striking use which the Apostle makes in Rom. 10:6 of the same passage (Dt. 30:12-14) already employed in the Wisdom hymn of Bar. 3:9ff. Baruch is reproaching Israel with having brought exile upon themselves for having "forsaken the fountain of wisdom" and "the way of God." He reminds them that they alone of all peoples had been chosen of God as the people of revelation. For even the giants which were of old "God did not choose, neither gave he the way of knowledge unto them; so they perished because they had no wisdom." Still speaking of the Wisdom of God, he continues,

> Who hath gone up into heaven and taken her and brought her down from the clouds?
> Who hath gone over the sea and found her, and will bring her for choice gold?

Then he answers his own question concerning the gift of the Father of the lights. It is "he that sendeth forth the light and it goeth," at whose command "the stars shined in their watches and were glad," who

makes this gift to Israel. Then Baruch adopts Isaiah's figure of the witnessing Servant,

> He (God) hath found out all the way of knowledge,
> And hath given it unto Jacob his Servant
> And to Israel that is his Beloved.

So Paul also, when, like James, he wishes to define "the righteousness which is of faith," appeals to the same passage of Deuteronomy as Baruch. As in the Wisdom hymn we read of the bringing down of the Torah from heaven or its fetching from across the sea, so Paul turns to the same standard passage from Dt. 30:12f., but with insistence on a Christian application:

> But the righteousness which is of faith saith thus, "Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (That is, to bring Christ down:) or, Who shall descend into the abyss (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what saith it? "The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart:" that is, the word of faith, which we preach.

There is no way to make Paul's parenthetic interpretations of the passage from Deuteronomy intelligible unless we come at his meaning through the "wisdom" teachings exemplified in Baruch. We must recognize that Paul identifies the Lord and "the Spirit." We must realize that this redemptive spirit of divine love, which is neither to be brought from beyond the sea nor from the nether world, is to him

identical with "the Wisdom of God" celebrated in lyric Wisdom, and that it had "appeared upon earth and been seen among men" not merely in Israel as a people, but specifically and individually in Jesus the Servant, the Elect One whose place had been "before the Lord of spirits," a Son of Man filled with "the spirit of wisdom and the spirit of might and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness."

To do this is to appreciate that to Paul as well as to "James" the gift of God in Christ is a new Torah, a royal law, an inward mirror of the soul, a "wisdom which cometh down from above, pure, peaceable, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, whose fruit is righteousness, a harvest sown in peace for those that make peace." "James" is up in arms against that type of Pauline teaching which he regards as destructive of the Law, the doctrine that "a man is justified by faith apart from works." The doctrine of the *suffering Servant*, as we have seen, is as conspicuously absent from his Epistle as it is prominent in "Peter." But his doctrine of sanctification by Life in the Spirit, the "gift of God," is not far from Paul's gospel of "Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."

It is true that the conception of Christ as Torah

sounds somewhat strange to Paul. The technical expressions Word (λόγος) and Wisdom (σοφία) are scarcely less so. But there is a middle link between Paul and "James." The lost writing known as the *Preaching of Peter* (Κήρυγμα Πέτρου), virtually contemporary with our own Book of Acts, since it was employed so early as by Ignatius, and closely akin to some elements of Acts, already attempts an adjustment of the Church's Christology to current Stoicism.[7] In three different places Clement of Alexandria, who gives us our most important extracts from the *Kerygma,* informs us that the titles applied to Christ in this primitive manual of missions were Word (Λόγος) and Law (Νόμος). It is not so much in Greek writings, or even in Hellenistic, that we should look for the deeper-lying root-ideas which in spite of all differences unite the conceptions of Paul to those of even the most divergent types of Christian teaching. It is in the Hellenistic Jewish thought of prechristian times whose chief home and seat was Alexandria.

The rite of baptism was no mere local practice of some branches of the Church. It was common to all from the beginning, and to all alike it signified something beyond the baptism of John. That something was "the gift of the Spirit." It is true that

[7] The fragments are given in Preuschen, *Antilegomena.* Fragment 1, a-c gives the references for the Christological titles. Fragments 2-5 show the relation to Stoicism.

Acts 19:1-7 incorporates a curious tradition of an isolated sect at Ephesus who, when Paul came among them, knew no baptism save that of John. These were rebaptized and incorporated (together with Apollos of Alexandria, their leader) into the Pauline community. According to Luke, they were "disciples." Apollos "had been instructed in the way of the Lord," and "spake and taught accurately the things concerning Jesus." We must take Luke's word for it that they were really a Christian, not a mere Johannine, sect. If so, their origin was from some primeval group which had remained a stranger to the Pentecostal experience, an offshoot either of the Jerusalem or the Galilean stock before the development of the doctrine of the Spirit, but like the rest in taking over the baptism of John.

Leaving for later consideration this sporadic case at Ephesus, which only confirms the general proof that Christian baptism was not looked upon as valid without the gift of the Spirit, we note that there are certain lines of affinity connecting Paul's doctrine of Life in the Spirit with "James," a writing which on other accounts might seem least in agreement with Paulinism. But these lines of affinity are not direct. They indicate no literary influence of Paul upon "James," nor of "James" upon Paul. The Epistle of James ignores entirely the word of the cross. So far as it can be said to present Christ at all, one might

almost call it a Christ that comes by water only and not by water and blood. But at least in its doctrine of the gift of the Spirit as an inward law, a spirit of faith and obedience working "the righteousness of God," sent down as a free gift from the Father of lights, it stands nearer to Paul than does any other New Testament writing. And the reason is made very apparent by comparison of contemporary and older Jewish teaching. The doctrine of renewal by the Spirit does not originate with Paul. Even the Pharisean author of the *Book of Jubilees* does not look to repentance alone to bring about the redemption of Israel. Only in the day when God himself "creates in them a holy spirit" and thus "makes them clean" will they be able to overcome the evil disposition (the *yetser ha-ra*) which is in them. Clearly the writer has in mind the Psalmist's prayer, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me, restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and take not thy holy Spirit from me." So with those who interpreted the significance of Christian baptism. As we see from the Synoptic Gospels, the predominant idea was to show how in the case of Jesus it had fulfilled the ideal of the "anointed Servant," according to the Scripture:

Behold my Servant, whom I have chosen,
My Beloved, on whom my soul fixed her desire.
I will put my spirit upon him,
He shall bring forth true religion to the Gentiles.

But there cannot have been wanting other Christians who in their instruction of the neophyte gave to baptism the significance of that "proselyte" baptism from which John had adopted it. In the language of Ezekiel 36:25-27, proselyte baptism had this effect:

I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean:
From all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you.
A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you;
And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh and will give you a heart of flesh.
And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes.

Cleansing from the pollutions of idols was not the only requirement of the neophyte. He must also have the Spirit of Adoption. Like Paul, the Rabbis also maintained that the line between human freedom and divine sovereignty is indefinable. Even while we exert our wills to the utmost to work out our own salvation, we cannot but realize that it is God that worketh in us even to will as well as to do of his good pleasure. All things are foreordained (so the Rabbis maintained the divine sovereignty); yet freedom is given (so they maintained with equal emphasis man's moral responsibility). Even repentance is not the work of man's will only. The Book of Lamentations offers the prayer: "Turn us back unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned: renew our days as of old."

Repentance is something God must effect. The Midrash comments by making Israel say to God: "It is thy business to bring us back. Nay, God replies, It is your business to make the beginning. But Israel rejoins (each party quoting Scriptural verses), Not so, it is *Thy* business!" So the issue is left undecided.[8] One could not better illustrate the hopelessness of the problem; nevertheless, the emphasis is always placed by the Rabbis on the divine quality of "grace." It is this divine gift of "grace" to which our Christian Wisdom writing looks as the ground of salvation. A people that seeks the friendship of the world, seduced by its pleasures, is guilty of breaking its marriage vow to God. But it is the teaching of "Scripture" [9] (Ex. 20:5; Hos. 2:19f.; Jer. 3:14) that the Spirit which God made to dwell in us yearneth for us even unto jealous envy. God is jealous over the wayward people whom he betrothed to himself in righteousness. But his remedy for the evil of a world of wickedness is the gift of "more grace." Humble penitence will bring obedience, purity, and peace (Jas. 4:1-10).

It is a strange answer which we receive from "James" to the question, What constitutes the Apostolic Message? He addresses the same readers as

[8] See Montefiore, *Old Testament and After,* p. 334.

[9] Some unknown writing seems to be the immediate source (see Ropes, *I. C. C.* ad loc.), but the underlying doctrine is undeniably scriptural.

"Peter," a people of the divine Sowing (Diaspora). Only, the constituency is wider. It is not merely the broad field sown by heralds of the glad tidings in Asia Minor (Paul's mission field) to which "James" addresses his exhortation, but "twelve tribes" scattered "throughout the world." But, as we have seen, "James" has not one trace of "the word of the cross." As for the doctrine of "Justification by Faith apart from works of law," his only reference to it is a warning against it. As regards the other factor of Paul's gospel, on the other hand, the doctrine of Life in the Spirit, the very sources of Paul's teaching are here uncovered. Salvation is due to the Spirit's indwelling presence. It is the soul's seed of life, a sowing from the Father of lights, to which the heart is laid open by the prayer of penitent, humble "faith." The divine gift is not only an outward "word of the gospel" proclaimed by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven (I Pt. 1:12, 25; cf. Rom. 10:8), but the Spirit itself, a "wisdom" from above, an inward Torah, at once the mirror and the impulse of the soul. "James" has not even a word to say concerning baptism, which to "Peter" was a form of "appeal for a good conscience toward God." To "James," baptism is not even a medium of the "gift of the Spirit." His medium of purification is "the word spoken" (cf. Jn: 13:2-11; 15:3). It is not a "washing of water *with* the word" (Eph. 5:26). It is the word itself, a Torah

both spoken and unspoken, a redeeming inward potency from heaven, which outwardly is uttered by God's messengers. He does not say with Paul, "The Lord *is* the Spirit." Neither of the two is dependent on the other for the doctrine of an indwelling Spirit of God "yearning over" the wayward spirits of men even unto jealous envy, or for that of a heavenly Torah brought down to earth, a Wisdom of God incarnate among men. Both go back to the wisdom writers of Alexandria and the Rabbis of Jerusalem for this doctrine of the redeeming Spirit. Neither can be fully appreciated without the other. Both require this prechristian Hellenistic Jewish mysticism as the very groundwork for any historical interpretation.

On another side, our study of the type of Christian doctrine represented in James is indispensable. We shall have occasion later to consider what answer Synoptic tradition and its sources have to make to the question before us. It is important, therefore, to observe whether (as often alleged) there be in James "a large dependence on the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels." Coincidences are undoubtedly present, and are worthy of individual study, but the sober judgment of Ropes [10] is to the effect that "the broad fact that we find James following some of the larger interests of the Synoptic Gospels, and entirely

[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

untouched by others," such as "interest in the death of Christ," is "more significant than these single and disputable points." It is a certain "type of religion," according to Ropes, that has "chosen the sayings in the Gospels" in such a way as to emphasize exactly the same points as James. This accounts for "his ever-recurring insistence on doing, both in itself and in contrast to merely hearing or saying," and for similar characteristics. To Ropes, this choice of sayings seems specially characteristic of Matthew. Others might think it more distinctive of Luke. The coincidence appears in

> the value set on poverty and the warning to the rich, with the injunctions to prayer, to complete devotion to God (Mt. 6:19-34) [11], to restraint in judging and in unkind speech, and in other topics. These are mostly ideas natural to devout Judaism; the point to be noted is the special and strong interest in them found alike in the compilers of the Gospels (or of their source) and in James.

The parenthetic "or of their source" shows the true bearing of these significant observations. As Ropes himself states the matter a few lines further on,

> James was in religious ideas nearer to *the men who collected the sayings of Jesus* than to the authors of the Gospels, but his religious interests are not identical with those of either group.

When we come to compare our two witnesses to the primitive collection of the Sayings of Jesus it will be

[11] The Lukan parallels are more apposite in their authentic settings: Lk. 11:33-36; 12:22-29, 32-34; 16:13.

in order to inquire whether it be Matthew, with his five great codes, or Luke, with his scattered discourses on The Righteousness of Sons, prefaced by blessings on the poor *and woes on the rich* (cf. Jas. 5:1ff.), and closing with the parable of "hearers and doers of the word" (Lk. 6:20-49), Prayer (Lk. 11:1-13), True Wealth (Lk. 12:13-34) and others similar, which brings us really nearer to the "collectors" among whom this "type of religion" prevailed. In either case, Ropes is quite right in saying that the religious interests of James are not identical either with those of our evangelists or of these "collectors." For while it is easily seen to be the common source of Matthew and Luke which furnishes them their double-tradition (Q) material, rather than the canonical evangelists themselves which display the affinity with James, nevertheless the figure which is central to the thought of the "collectors," or at least to their main representative, is, as we shall see, the figure of the Isaian Servant, anointed with the Spirit for the redemption of Israel and the execution of God's purpose for the Gentiles. This figure is absent from James.

On the other hand, as we shall also observe in the Q material most characteristic of the source, the Servant is (as in Wisdom of Solomon) an incarnation of "the Wisdom of God." Jesus speaks in this name. Those who come to him are Wisdom's chil-

dren, his baptism symbolizes the redemptive power of God coming down with tender yearning like that of the brooding dove to win men to the paths of peace. He utters the invitation of God's Wisdom, and suffers her fate of rejection at the hands of a rebellious people. He will come again to the house she has left "forsaken," but not till they shall have learned to say: "Hosanna. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." If James shows unmistakable dependence on the doctrines of Jewish Wisdom, this also must be reckoned a point of affinity with the collectors of the Sayings of Jesus.

To localize the "type of religious teaching" which early in the second century passed under the name of "James" is no small help toward the solution of the intricate Synoptic problem. This is an achievement to which Ropes has made a distinct contribution. It would be an exaggeration to compare the relation of this Epistle to the Teaching Source with the relation of the Johannine Epistles to the Ephesian Gospel. Nevertheless the affinity is real. And the place and date can be fixed within limits.

The writer and the readers whom (the author of James) expected to reach by his tract were Greek-speaking Jewish Christians in Palestine. The churches are apparently past the earlier stages of their life; they had been formed not very recently and are living under settled conditions among Jewish neighbors as an accepted part of the whole Palestinian community. Neither life nor thought in the church is dominated by passionate missionary effort. No crisis

seems present in the internal affairs of these believers; and there is no indication of public disturbance or of recent or impending calamity in civil matters. The great controversy over the Law, of which we read in the Acts and the Epistles of Paul, is no longer rife.

The writer himself writes Greek with entire facility, and has become so familiar with the literary type of the Hellenistic diatribe that he can freely use it (evidently not for the first time here) as the vehicle of his Christian admonitions. He is himself, no doubt, a Jew, but accustomed to read the Old Testament in the Septuagint version. His main ideas are Jewish and his distinctively Christian thinking primitive though unmistakable. Religion appears to him mainly in the guise of a noble spiritual Law. He is later than Paul, of whose formulas he disapproves without understanding their real purpose. Singularly devoid of contact with the progressive movements which were elsewhere developing toward second-century Christian thought, he does not descry within his horizon, still less contain in himself, any of the germinant heresies of the age. Even the tendencies which led the exclusive and stagnant form of Jewish Christianity to solidify itself into a heresy are alien to him. He represents an admirable type of Christianity, but one of extraordinary intellectual isolation.

Professor Ropes has depicted the writer of James and the circles in which he moves and for whom he speaks with a master hand. To be able to locate such a group in the development of primitive Christianity is of the utmost value to such an inquiry as ours. But have we sufficient ground for speaking of its "extraordinary intellectual isolation"? Certainly the phenomena of the development of Synoptic tradition in just this region and during just this period

would not lead us to look for "isolation" as characteristic of the Greek-speaking communities of the Palestinian church. They may have felt little disposed to learn from their Gentile brethren, and they feel no sympathy for "the exclusive and stagnant form of Jewish Christianity" known to second-century writers as Ebionism, but they certainly felt that they had much to impart, unless all indications whether of internal evidence or ancient tradition for the origins of the Gospels are wholly misleading. And Professor Ropes himself is not backward in pointing out the close affinity of the type of religious teaching here represented with that of the "collectors" of the Sayings of Jesus. To that special form of the Petrine tradition which is represented in Mark, we have reasons both external and internal for assigning a Roman origin. But the Teaching Source from which both Matthew and Luke have drawn their chief supplements to Mark had surely a Palestinian origin. To what circles should we ascribe it, at least in that Greek translation which seems to have lain before Matthew and Luke, if not to the circles represented by James?

Assuming then, with Professor Ropes, "that the epistle was written by a Christian teacher in some half-hellenistic city of Palestine, in the period of quiet after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.," we

may look for the required conditions in a number of towns in Palestine, but, among these, Cæsarea, the Roman capital, is rightly suggested as typical.

> Here was a Romanised city containing a population partly Jewish, partly heathen, in which the writer's contact with Hellenistic moral preaching would be easily supposable, but where the Christians would not have found themselves out of relation to Jewish life. Christians existed at Cæsarea from an early time (Acts 10-11, 21:8, 16), and its continued importance as a Christian center is attested by the references in the Clementine *Recognitions*. No sufficient reason exists for thinking that the author of the Epistle of James actually lived here, but it happens that more is known about Cæsarea than about most similar places, and it is instructive to find that its known circumstances would well account for the origin of the epistle.

At this point we may leave the problem. At a later point in our inquiry, the question may be raised again of the type of religious teaching here presented under the name of "James." For the present it will not be unserviceable to have determined a form of the Apostolic Message differing almost as widely from "Peter" as from Paul, destitute to an amazing degree of the "word of the cross," and yet close to Paul in his doctrine of Life in the Spirit, uncovering indeed, as it were, the very roots of Paul's interpretation of the "spiritual" Christ.

PART II.

IN THE TIME OF JESUS

CHAPTER VI.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE RECORD

THE general survey of Christianity in its first-century development which we are enabled to make through comparison of the Pauline Epistles with the writings ascribed to Peter, or which claim his authority, and the Epistle of James, shows two widely different types of religious teaching. Both of these types belong to later Judaism, and both are combined in the teaching of Paul. In support of his doctrine of forgiveness of sins through the sacrificial love of Jesus and his intercession in heaven for sinners, Paul had no other human recourse than the testimony of Peter. He appeals to it, when his teaching is challenged, in a manner which makes Peter directly responsible. When something more is required of Gentile converts than simple trust in the grace of the Lord Jesus to give them full equality of standing with their brethren of Jewish descent and observance, Paul tells of his challenge first to the "Pillars" in Jerusalem, afterward to Peter before the whole Antioch church. He demanded to know whereon Peter's own hope of justification at the judgment

seat of God rested, if not on this same faith, and this alone. In the same connection he goes on to speak (ostensibly in report of his actual utterance to Peter before the Antioch church) of a "love of Christ" for him individually. The phrase, "Who loved me and gave himself up for me," can refer in such a connection to nothing else save the self-dedication of Jesus commemorated in the eucharistic rite. It is the same "love of Christ," or "love of God in Christ," which is Paul's assurance of "justification," in face of Satan's accusation in Rom. 8:31-39. Here, at least, there can be no question of the specific reference.

This, then, was primitive common gospel. When in Rom. 8:31-39, Paul dwells at greater length on this "love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" as his only assurance against the accusations of hostile angelic powers, we have given us a clearer view of his conception of "justification." Jesus will be his "advocate," his heavenly intercessor. To attempt to plead any "good works" of his own would be an impertinence, an act of unfaith, an exhibition of lack of confidence in the ability or faithfulness of this Intercessor. Primitive soteriology rested on this intercession of Jesus. Without the presence of the risen Advocate in heaven, Christians would be "yet in their sins" (I Cor. 15:17).

When in I Cor. 11:23ff. Paul rebukes the irreverent observance of the eucharist at Corinth, we have

given us a clearer view of the historical circumstances on which assurance of this redeeming "love of Christ" was based. Those from whom Paul had "received" the story had declared that Jesus "gave his body" for them. They regarded the accompanying cup of wine as a symbol which Jesus had himself instituted of the sacrifice of his life for their sakes. It may be Paul himself who introduces the allusion to the "new covenant" of Jer. 31:31ff., but he certainly did not misrepresent the sense given originally by the whole Church to the ritual when he treated it as a memorial of the vicarious suffering of the Servant of Jehovah. It was an offering of "the one for the many" (Mk. 14:24). It was regarded by all as the "redemption price" of a new Israel. This was the stumbling-block of the cross, the doctrine of "the grace of the Lord Jesus," which provoked persecution by the Pharisees.

Even were we to adopt the strange exegesis of I Cor. 11:23ff. which takes it to report the content of a special vision granted to Paul, making him acquainted with the events of the night of betrayal, it would still be necessary to assume that for others, including his readers, the events were known by normal methods of historical testimony, and that Paul's understanding agreed in substance with theirs. Doubtless other eye-witnesses besides Peter may have contributed to the stream of gospel teaching; but for

the Church at large, Peter's testimony is that universally appealed to, and for Paul in particular no other eye-witness can come into consideration. The witness of Peter is, therefore, just as much presupposed by Paul's faith in the love of Christ which he declared on earth, as by his assurance of the continued efficacy of that love in heaven. For Peter's experience of an "apostleship of the circumcision" through an inward working of God to manifest in him the risen Christ is presupposed in Paul's comparison to it of his own experience "unto an apostleship of the Gentiles." The priority of Peter is expressly acknowledged in Paul's declaration of the apostolic witness to the resurrection in I Cor. 15:3ff. Paul is certainly laying down here the fundamental outlines of the gospel as preached primarily by Peter when he gives as "the gospel which I received" a doctrine based on the Isaian description of the vicarious suffering of Jehovah's Servant, who "died for our sins" and was raised for our justification. For the "justification" here spoken of is a simple inference in Pauline phraseology (Rom. 4:25) from the immediate Isaian context (Is. 53:12), "He was a bearer of the sin of the many, and a maker of intercession for the transgressors."

As the very foundation-stone of Christian faith we may, therefore, set down this doctrine of the Servant: the love of Christ in his sacrificial death "for

the many"; his intercession for sinners at the right hand of God. This, if anything, is historically Petrine doctrine. It is the embodiment of the religious experience of the chief Apostle, the establisher of the brethren in the resurrection faith. We have it on the explicit witness of Paul, challenging denial from Peter or from any of Peter's way of thinking.

With or without conscious intent, this appeal to "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" was destined to take the place of temple and sacrifice. In the Epistle to the Hebrews this aspect of the new revelation is formally elaborated. The writer depicts Jesus as Leader of the noble army of martyrs, High Priest of our confession, and applies an Alexandrian typology to prove that the sacrificial and sacerdotal systems of previous ages were mere symbols of the one eternal sacrifice effected by Jesus when he passed within the veil, making intercession for the sin of the world, at once priest and victim. Some traces are to be found elsewhere of this sacerdotal aspect of the new faith, especially where, as in the Revelation of John, the sufferings of the martyrs come into the foreground. But this is exceptional. The whole trend of the age, whether in Jewish or Gentile thought, was away from the sacrificial system. Morality and mysticism were dominant even in the Synagogue. The type of religion which carried all before it was that which is best exemplified in the Wisdom writers of

Alexandria, ending in Philo for the Jewish world, and in the school of Platonizing Stoics for the Hellenistic world, with whom Philo found avowed affinity. Paul takes no interest in the sacerdotal system.

In the Epistle of James we find a type of Christian teaching at the opposite pole from the primitive Petrine. The doctrine of grace, in James, is purely a doctrine of Hellenistic mysticism, in that refined and ethical form in which it found its way into the teaching of the Synagogue. There is no mention of baptism. The outward "gifts of the Spirit" appear only as the official action of "the elders of the church" in answer to whose prayers God sends healing and forgiveness (Jas. 5:14-16). Over against these "gifts" stands the "Gift" of the Spirit. This is conceived as a constant outpouring of a divine Torah whose fruit is righteousness and peace; and this is the whole gospel "James" has to offer. From Sirach to the Sermon on the Mount, this Wisdom writer of the New Testament sounds every essential note of Hellenistic-Jewish piety except that of the suffering Servant. He is a Christian; but of the later, Hellenistic Synagogue, destitute of the word of the cross, and unable to appreciate the meaning of Paul.

Nevertheless, it is an ethically refined doctrine of "the Spirit," of identical type with that of Jesus, which Paul brings to bear upon the orgiastic and

thaumaturgic conceptions all too prevalent in the churches he had founded. Baptism is a rite which Paul found in vogue among Christians everywhere. And in all cases save one (the curious body of Johannine disciples at Ephesus) it seems to have been coupled in thought with "tongues," "prophecy," miracles, healings, and similar manifestations regarded as "powers of the age to come." Paul does not differ from his fellow-Christians in holding these gifts to be an "earnest" of perfect endowment hereafter, "spoils" captured by Christ at his resurrection from "the mighty ones." But Paul insists, like the high-minded rabbi he was, on a complete moralization of the spiritual phenomena. Unless rooted and grounded in "love," fruits of the moral disposition of Jesus, they would surely merge with the ordinary type of Hellenistic "enthusiasm" (ἐνθουσιασμός). The spirit manifested in the gifts must be in character like the "mind" of Christ. It must spring from faith and hope and (supremely) love. It must, in short, be the eternal spirit of the God and Father of the Lord; it must be "Christ in us"; else the spectacular manifestations would be worthless and evanescent.

In his attitude toward the "gifts of the Spirit" Paul therefore shows decided affinity with "James." In fact, baptism itself has no interest for him except as it serves to clothe in concrete symbolism that moral death and resurrection with Christ which was the

essence of his distinctive gospel. He seldom performed the rite himself, not regarding it as part of his personal commission from the Lord. He approved it as a rite of initiation into the new Israel of God, an adoption like circumcision, only "not made with hands." By it men were baptized unto Christ, as Israel, at the redemption out of Egypt, were baptized unto Moses "in the cloud (typifying the Spirit) and in the sea." Believers acknowledged Jesus as "Lord," confessing him in this act, and were reciprocally acknowledged ("known") of God by endowments of the Spirit of Adoption. But "discrimination of spirits" is a very real thing with Paul. He has one absolute test, a moral one: Is it Christ for this man to live? Are his impulses, hitherto rebellious, brought into subjection to the law of Christ? Moral transformation was to Paul the vital thing. His doctrine that the Lord *is* the Spirit was no mere theological speculation.

It had the highest practical value. He himself could say, "It is no more I that live, but Christ that liveth in me." If a man was not led by this spirit of Christ (easily identifiable by the nature and career of the Servant), he was "none of his." In all this insistence on the "fruits of the Spirit," this ethical mysticism, Paul and "James" are at one. They stand together over against the estimate placed on outward manifestations of the Spirit in Synoptic

tradition. If we designate this ethical mysticism specifically Hellenistic, then we should follow the example of the author of Acts in bringing Paul into specially close relation with Stephen and the "Hellenistic Jews" of Jerusalem. But Paul's own letters give little or no support to such a connection. Paul's relations to Hellenistic mysticism through his Greek environment, both before and after conversion, had probably less to do with his doctrine of Life in the Spirit than what Synagogue teaching had itself already imbibed from Hellenistic sources at the hands of men like Gamaliel. It is a deutero-James that meets us in the Epistle, but Paul's affinity with this "James" dates from prechristian times.

If, then, we are justified in supposing that the rite of baptism which Paul found in use when he became a Christian, together with its attendant "pneumatic" phenomena, was an inheritance from Peter, we shall still have no resort to any direct contact with the circles represented by "James" to account for Paul's somewhat more critical attitude toward this element of the common faith. Paul's religion is summed up in two words: "faith" and "love." "Faith" is the attitude the sinner must assume toward the love of God, which is commended to him in that Christ died for us. Conscious of guilt, a man cannot expect to have peace with God until he believes in God's love for him. If he does

trust the love of God manifested in this work of the Servant, then he has this "peace," having received the "reconciliation." He comes to the God and Father of Jesus Christ as the convert to Judaism came "to take refuge under the wings of the Shekinah." He knows Him as a Being to be completely trusted, by the work which the Servant did in His name. Faith like that with which Abraham launched forth upon the unknown, relying upon a covenant of promise, faith like that of converts who turned from heathenism to the God of Abraham, faith like that required of Israel when they followed Moses into the waste, howling wilderness—such trust, confidence, loyalty, must be a man's response to the act of grace. Faith is the only "work" that an act of divine love and grace can require. But it is compelled to require this; for without it, even divine love and grace must go for nought. They cannot give either peace or joy.

This, then, is the primitive doctrine of "justification by faith." The Supper merely commemorates that divine potency of redemptive love which is in the world in myriad forms from the beginning, but came to full flower in the sacrificial death of Jesus. How can the conscious sinner have peace with God unless he trusts it? And if he does trust it, there is for him henceforth no condemnation. He is assured of the forgiveness of sins.

But without a complementary doctrine of sanctification in the Spirit, this doctrine of justification by faith would be open to abuses keenly apprehended by every mind schooled in the stern ethics of Pharisaism. Paul's defense against such abuse is clearly discernible in his critical attitude toward current manifestations of "the Spirit." If faith be the indispensable attitude of soul without which even the love of God in Christ cannot give us peace, reciprocally love is that quality without which there can be no sanctification or life in the Spirit. In the memorial supper we meet the redeeming love of God. Our faith makes it a reality. Then, by a self-dedication in baptism into the name of Christ, we open our souls to the incoming of that spirit of sacrificial love from which alone true virtue can spring. The love of Christ "constrains" us to share the self-devotion of his death. Thenceforth we live "no longer unto ourselves, but unto him who for our sakes died and rose again." Paul has faith in the love of God because he sees it "commended" in Christ. That is the essence of his doctrine of atonement. He holds to this faith in redeeming grace in spite of every objection that can be raised on grounds of "justice" or "law," or height or depth or any other creature. He fully realizes, even without the bitter opposition and slander continually heaped upon this doctrine of "grace," that it is open to abuse. He

defends it on the ground of experience. As a matter of simple experience he knows that men *are* redeemed and *are* renewed in the image of Christ, and *are* made a new creation by the gift of the Spirit. They are thus made separate from the world. They do become thus "sons and daughters of the Highest." Christ does live in them as an eternal spirit of redemptive power. Consequently, Paul's conception of baptism, and especially of the attendant "gifts of the Spirit," is characterized by the same moral emphasis as when he criticizes the too lighthearted observance of the Supper at Corinth. In Rom. 6 he follows up his exposition of the atonement doctrine set forth in the Supper ("the reconciliation") with an exposition of the significance of baptism. Just as in I Cor. 11:20ff. moral participation in the death of Christ is the one thing insisted on, a necessary factor to redeem the observance from abuse, so here with reference to baptism. The Romans cannot be ignorant, he declares (with tacit implication, nevertheless, that they may need to be reminded), "that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death." Baptism is a symbol of participation in the death and resurrection of Jesus. In it we "present ourselves unto God as alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness to God." God is to use them for His own purposes of righteousness.

Hence the gifts of the Spirit are a moral trust. Because they are "Christ in us," they are also "the hope of glory." They afford an earnest of full redemption, since for the practical present they are shown to be a power of deliverance from sin. The great chapters which next follow (Rom. 7-8) show how this doctrine works out in individual and general application.

Thus for Paul the doctrine of baptism as new birth through the Spirit, moral renewal by mystical reënforcement of the inward man, corrects all possibility of abuse of the doctrine of justification by simple faith. The believer approaches baptism in the spirit of absolute self-dedication in which Jesus went to the cross. He gives himself, his body, his members, to God "as alive from the dead." Why should God need to punish such a man for past misdeeds? Plato, the Stoics, Philo, the Rabbis, all had taught that the object of punishment is not the appeasing of wrath. If to Greek thought the very idea of divine "wrath" was abhorrent, Jewish circles such as those of Paul's training had long since ceased to use the term in any sense incompatible with perfect liberty and disposition on God's part to forgive without limit. Whether Paul would have accepted the doctrine of Plato that punishment has no object save the benefit of the offender, we cannot certainly say. But at least it is certain that he would not

have tolerated either Anselmic or Grotian limitations on the divine right to extend forgiveness wherever the grace will not be abused. And the guarantee that it will not be abused is the divine knowledge of the heart which has been offered in baptism as a living sacrifice. If the self-dedication was sincere and absolute, there is no more room for punishment. Henceforth there can be "no more condemnation for them that are in Christ Jesus" (those who, as the modern would say, "belong to him"), "since they walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."

Thus Paul defends his doctrine of Justification by Faith by his doctrine of Life in the Spirit. Neither is to be maintained without the other. Both are as universally current in Christian circles as the sacraments themselves, though possibly under less theological designations. But the moral tone of both requires to be maintained by constant reference to the story of Jesus. "The Spirit" is not *his* spirit unless it have the moral characteristics of the Servant. The "grace" is not *his* grace unless appropriated in the faith which can say, "He loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*."

In attempting to interpret Paul it is needful, at least for modern scholarship, to have regard for recent historical research. And from this we can at least learn to discard the idea that questions of moral accountability in relation to divine forgive-

ness represented anything new in Paul's time and in Pharisean circles. We have already observed that this had been one of the chief subjects of debate since the times of Ezekiel among the religious-minded. It is implied not only in the Pauline Epistles, but in other early Christian documents, such as the martyrdom of James as reported by Hegesippus, that the "gate of Jesus" which stirred the Pharisees to bitter opposition was the Christian doctrine of "grace." The Pharisees too believed in the forgiveness of sins, but not "for his name's sake." Their doctrine of solidarity (*zechuth*) allowed a certain value to the merit of other names, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the patriarchs. Because of his favor to these, Jehovah would send, it was believed, a Redeemer to their posterity. The intercession of the Messiah was certainly no small factor in the hope of Israel. It is clearly expressed in the Targumic rendering of Is. 53:4: "Then for our sins he (Messiah) will pray, and our iniquities will for his sake be forgiven." Even the suffering of Jewish martyrs who had gone through fire and through water "for the sanctification of the Name" was allowed its value. But, as we have seen, such doctrines were carefully watched and guarded. The danger of abuse was obvious. They were allowed a national, but not an individual, application. Personal accountability was the very watchword of Pharisa-

ism. The Pharisees might hold aloof from movements like the popular reformation of the Baptist, but not because John taught the universal need of repentance, nor even because he declared dependence on descent from Abraham futile. Even a Pharisee could say Amen to the cry, "Think not to say unto yourselves: We are Abraham's children; I say unto you God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." But the Pharisees and all the Jews were bitterly jealous of any letting down of the bars to the unworthy. And certainly there was something to justify their charge that "the gate of Jesus" was being thrown open to many who, when inspection was made, had little to show of those "righteous deeds of the saints" which constitute the white linen of the companions of the Messiah in the apocalyptic vision, and the "wedding garment" in the Matthean form of the parable of the Great Supper.

It is here that Paul is continually put upon the defensive, not merely by his former associates in Pharisaism, but by the more conservative elements of the Church. What the nature of the opposition was which the Apostle encountered, we have already seen to the extent his letters allow. It will enable us better to judge the environment from which our Synoptic records are derived if we adduce one or two examples from contemporary Jewish

writers who express themselves on this question of "grace," perhaps with special reference to what they regard as Christian laxity; but if not with any such special reference, then at least with reference to the general danger which writers such as "James" and "Matthew" apprehend from a doctrine of Justification by Faith apart from works. Matthew's designation for this view of "grace" is "lawlessness" (ἀνομία).

Josephus, in his *Antiquities* VI, vii. 4, expresses his mind quite fully on the ill effects of dependence on intercession for the forgiveness of sins in the case of Samuel's intercession for the forgiveness of Saul, after the king's disobedience to the command to exterminate the Amalekites.

> When Samuel heard that (God's determination to set aside Saul) he was very troubled, and began to beseech God all that night to be reconciled (καταλλάττεσθαι) to Saul and not to be angry with him. But he did not grant that forgiveness to Saul which the prophet asked, deeming it unjust to forgive sins because of intercession (λογισάμενος οὐκ εἶναι δίκαιον ἁμαρτήματα χαρίζεσθαι παραιτήσει); for they grow by nothing so much as the indulgence extended by those who have suffered injury. For when people seek a reputation for kindness and gentleness (ἐπιεικεία καὶ χρηστότης) they unwittingly become themselves promoters of sins.

Josephus may not have specifically in view the "kindness and gentleness" ascribed to Jesus as the interceding Servant, but he unquestionably exemplifies one of those who would hold that this reputa-

tion for kindness and gentleness made Christ "a minister of sin" (Gal. 2:17). One could hardly ask a better commentary on the language by which the former Pharisee Paul justifies his doctrine of forgiveness of sins by pure "grace," on the intercession of a Mediator. The forbearance of God in passing over sins done aforetime, says Paul, does *not* prove him "unjust." For in setting forth Jesus as a token of propitiation (ἱλαστήριον), his blood the offering, so that those who now approach in faith receive the forgiveness of their sins, God merely "demonstrates his own righteousness." In Johannine language, such forgiveness is an act of "faithfulness and justice" on God's part. He is faithful to his promise and secures the ends of perfect righteousness (not vindictiveness). Because the "faith" with which the believer approaches the sacrifice is God's guarantee that His "kindness and gentleness" will not be abused (Rom. 3:25f.).

Or let us take a more religious nature than the hard and self-righteous Josephus. The contemporary writer of II Esdras cannot be called lacking in the sentiment of pity and compassion, since the fate of lost sinners is the agony of his soul. Nowhere in non-Christian literature can we find one who approaches so near to Paul in distress over that awful doctrine of election to eternal rejection which is the unavoidable converse of the current

Jewish doctrine of election to salvation. In II Esdras 7:102ff. this Jewish writer expresses his mind with even greater fulness than Josephus with regard to this (in his view) dangerous doctrine of forgiveness through "grace," or more particularly through mediation or intercession.

> And I answered and said, if I have found favor in thy sight, show further unto me thy servant whether in the day of judgment the just will be able to intercede for the ungodly, or to intreat the Most High for them, whether fathers for children, or children for parents, or brethren for brethren, or kinsfolk for their next of kin, or friends for them that are most dear. And he answered me and said, Since thou hast found favor in my sight I will show thee this also: The day of judgment is a day of (final) decision, and displayeth unto all the seal of truth; even as now a father sendeth not his son, or a son his father, or a master his slave, or a friend him that is most dear, that in his stead he may be sick, or sleep, or eat, or be healed; so never shall anyone pray for another in that day, neither shall anyone lay a burden on another (to intercede for him), for then shall all bear everyone his own righteousness or unrighteousness.

Even with this seemingly inexorable answer Esdras is not satisfied. He pleads the many scriptural instances which seem to ascribe divine forgiveness to human intercession, including that on which Josephus comments.

> And I answered and said, How do we now find that first Abraham prayed for the people of Sodom, and Moses for the fathers that sinned in the wilderness, and Joshua after him for Israel in the days of Achar, and Samuel in the days of Saul, and David for the plague, and Solomon for

those that should worship in the sanctuary, and Elijah for those that received rain, and for the dead child that he might live, and Hezekiah for the people in the days of Sennacherib, and many for many?

The answer is interesting. Naturally, Esdras cannot deny the efficacy of prayer. "James" too encourages prayer for the sick, and even for the forgiveness of sins whose consequences are being suffered by the sick. He appeals, moreover, to the example of Elijah's prayer for rain. The compiler of the Second Source devotes one entire discourse of Jesus to this subject of effectual fervent prayer (Lk. 11:1-13, to which should perhaps be added 18:1-8). So, too, Esdras is obliged to acknowledge that *for the present dispensation* the doctrine of *zechuth* is allowable. The present world, he is told, exhibits a temporary economy in which "they who were strong have prayed for the weak." Per contra, the day of judgment will mark a finality. "Then shall no man be able to have mercy on him that is condemned in the judgment, nor to thrust down him that has obtained a favorable verdict."

The Christian doctrine, at least in its primitive and apostolic form, differed from that of Esdras in refusing to draw a line of separation between the grace of God in one age or another. It was convinced that neither death nor life, nor accusing angels nor principalities, nor things present nor things

to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other created thing, could separate us from the love of God which had been manifested in Christ Jesus our Lord. In short, Christians maintained a "moral trust in the immortality of love," refusing to draw an arbitrary line between the here and the hereafter when considering "the legitimacy of intercessory prayer."

The special value of these citations from Jewish literature contemporary with our Synoptic Gospels will be apparent when we revert to the strange phenomenon already noted in the disappearance from the pages of Luke of all those features of the Servant doctrine which connect the suffering of Jesus with the forgiveness of sins. The problem of this disappearance of a doctrine certainly fundamental to primitive Christianity from the pages of a writer such as Luke, anxious to preserve what he esteems the most ancient and authentic sources, emphasizing beyond all others and in peculiar degree the argument from scriptural prediction of the cross and resurrection, is only paralleled by the strangeness of the total ignoring of the Servant Christology in James, and the substitution of a doctrine of salvation by good works produced through the indwelling of the wisdom-gift of God. Yet, great as they are, the changes are not unaccountable. They are paralleled by the almost complete disappearance of even the title "the Servant," for which we find substituted

almost everywhere "the Son." The disappearance is a mark of prudent second thought. The dangers attending the doctrine of "grace" as preached by Paul were now, in the post-apostolic age, only too apparent both to friend and foe. The reaction had set in. In Jewish-Christian circles, there was the fear of misrepresentation on the part of the Synagogue. In Pauline circles, there was apprehension (even more vivid than during the lifetime of the great Apostle) of such "lawlessness" as Paul himself had found it needful to rebuke. The tone of the age, as regards the doctrine of "grace" and its dangers, may be appreciated if we note the careful guarding by which both reporters of the parable of the Slighted Invitation supplement what they seem to regard as its dangerously sweeping inclusiveness. In Mt. 22:11-14, as we have already seen, the evangelist appends a new and incongruous feature to the parable. The King comes in to inspect the guests hastily gathered to the great supper. Finding one not clothed in a wedding-garment (these garments, according to Rev. 19:8, represent "the righteous deeds of the saints"), he commands him to be cast into the outer darkness. This supplement parallels the same evangelist's supplement to Mark's parable of the Patient Husbandman. In the Matthean form (Mt. 13:24-30, 36-43) a feature is added as incongruous as that of the chance-comer punished for

being unprepared in the parable of the Slighted Invitation. An enemy who sows tares in the wheat is introduced, an obviously allegorizing trait. In the full and elaborate interpretation which follows, our evangelist explains that the Enemy is the Evil One, the tares are "those that cause stumbling and do lawlessness" in the kingdom, who in the judgment-day will be cast into the hell of fire. The parable of the Net Full of Good and Bad Fish attached at the close of the group (Mt. 13:47-50) is another example of this evangelist's special interest. The parable of The Sheep and the Goats, the climax of his account of the public teaching of Jesus, is still another. Where the chief religious interest of Matthew lies is not hard to define. The very phraseology is distinctive. Church morality requires to be keyed up.

The interest of Luke is less pronounced along this moralizing line, but it is still unmistakable. The parable of The Slighted Invitation seems to Luke as well as to Matthew liable to misinterpretation without a supplement. Hence he appends after the figure of the servants sent out into the highways and hedges to constrain all comers to the banquet, a group of sayings whose authenticity cannot be questioned, but for whose grouping here Luke is responsible. They teach the necessity of forsaking all, counting the cost, being seasoned with salt that will not lose its

savor (Lk. 14:25-35). Such editorial additions of the later Synoptists show the tendencies of the times. They need to be considered in connection with such contemporary writings as the Pastoral Epistles, Jude and James, if we would understand their immediate occasion.

Thus if the Gospel of Mark, with its heroic tone and reflection of the martyr spirit, recalls to some extent the times of fiery persecution to which I Peter is addressed, as well as something of the Petrine evangel of the suffering Servant, the later Synoptists are far more keenly alive to the insidious inward danger of moral laxity. The chief source of Luke and Matthew (after Mark) is that writing whose compilers, as Ropes so well points out, represent the same type of teaching as the Epistle of James. In the missionary age the Apostolic Message had been an offer of free forgiveness because of the vicarious suffering of the Servant, "that he might bring us to God." Now that the Apostles are gone, there is a reaction. We begin to hear the qualifications and the "buts." The invitation has been carried out into the highways and hedges. Now the question has become what to do with the unworthy. There is an insistent cry for sifting, sorting, weeding out. Paul, the great missionary of the first period, gives unmistakable references to the "gospel of the

reconciliation" as the common Apostolic Message. Yet even Paul shows the great and growing need to offset the offer of forgiveness for the Name's sake with a teaching of baptisms and of new Life in the Spirit. What wonder if in the generation after Paul the "word of the cross" fades almost out of view (in some peculiarly Jewish-Christian quarters, wholly out of view) behind a doctrine of the higher law. Peter is still spokesman for this age, and the doctrine of the Servant has not wholly disappeared. But it is the anointed rather than the suffering Servant who occupies the foreground, and the means of salvation is "the word of the gospel that was preached to you." This "word" may be construed as an external commandment to be obeyed, or more inwardly and mystically as a Law or Wisdom of God, but the emphasis of the message has passed from "grace" to law, from "faith" to repentance, as "the work of God" which saves.

Such were the conditions of religious thought in the period and environment of our Synoptic Gospels. Writings whose supreme object was to teach the significance of the two Christian observances which in earlier times had served as vehicles of the faith should be read with reference to this origin. We are accustomed to resort to the Synoptic record for a historical purpose, seeking to reconstruct the actual

earthly career of Jesus in order to take our place alongside of Paul in discerning the eternal Spirit in the person and work of Jesus. We wish to know "the mind of Christ" by study of his words and deeds. It is indeed only too possible for those who think themselves his followers not to know what spirit they are of. Early records ascribe such misapprehension even to a James and John. Also we wish to know what his martyrdom meant from the point of view of that divine Providence which has made it the greatest factor for human redemption in all history. It is not only our privilege, but our supreme duty, if ourselves charged with the transmission of this gospel, to use the recorded material in this historico-critical manner. Yet nothing is more certain than the fact that the material was not originally put together with this historical object mainly in view. The Gospels were *religious* writings. Religious edification was the primary purpose of their authors. After that we may place as a motive apologetic interest, and somewhere after that the preservation of religious history as such. Much progress has been made in the interpretation of them since critics awakened us to the part played by apologetic in the development of gospel story. Something more may still be gained by recognition of the primary purpose of all. We should keep in mind the Background of the Record. At least there

is room for better understanding of The Apostolic Message if, as we turn to a study of the actual career of Jesus, our attempts to reconstruct it from the documents keep the circumstances of their origin in view.

CHAPTER VII.

WHY JESUS WENT TO THE CROSS

IF we seek to follow the principle of Paul in interpreting the martyrdom of Jesus as an act of God, our first step must be in the direction followed by the historical critics. Our ultimate aim is religious, to determine for ourselves whether it be true and right to regard the cross as Paul does, to look upon it as a manifestation of the redemptive love of God bringing humanity into right relation with himself. But we cannot do this *for ourselves* until we have reverently set aside for the time being the interpretations of all who have gone before us, including even Paul. We must re-picture to ourselves the actual historical events as they would have appeared to the most dispassionate and neutral observer, and then at last make our personal evaluation of them from the standpoint of believers in a Power not ourselves that makes for righteousness in human history.

In times such as ours a sincere and honest faith cannot do otherwise. If Christianity is still to mean a moral trust in the immortality of love, this is the

path along which alone a genuine and open-eyed trust in God can reach the conclusion of Paul. Thus, and thus only, can his conviction justify itself to our minds, that in the tragedy of Calvary "God commendeth his own love to us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." This we have found to be the essence of the primitive evangel embodied in the Eucharist, the doctrine of the suffering and exalted Servant. We must seek out its historical beginnings. We shall need also to trace the beginnings of its complement, the doctrine embodied in the rite of Baptism regarding the Gift of the Spirit; but this, which was a later development of the Church's symbolism, can be deferred to a later chapter, in spite of the fact that it deals with an earlier period in Jesus' career. Ultimately we must place our own estimate on both elements of the primitive faith, the Atonement doctrine and the doctrine of Incarnation, or the Gift of the Spirit.

A historical view of the story of the cross, which forms the second part of Gospel tradition, may be subdivided on the basis of two main questions: (1) Why did Jesus, at the end of his Galilean ministry, "stedfastly set his face to go up to Jerusalem," braving the menace of the cross? (2) What sense did he give to the parting observance, on whose language the later evangel appears to have been built?

Subdivision along some such lines will be needful for even the briefest survey. For the task of detaching the embroidery of later religious thought is difficult. Only the utmost delicacy and tact will enable the critic rightly to distinguish in the record between historical occurrence and doctrinal, religious, apologetic, or theological elaboration. And even the earliest forms of the tradition which have come down to us already show plain marks of adaptation to such purposes. Paul himself, our earliest witness, makes no secret of his effort to present the religious aspect of the tragedy rather than the historically realistic; and the latter only is our immediate aim.

Paul glories in his mission to denationalize the story, which we, on our part, must restore to its significance as the climax of the mission of Israel. Paul substitutes a Son of God for the Servant of Jehovah, a Second Adam for the Son of David, a Reconciliation of the world for the reconciliation of the wayward people of the election, a "wrath of God revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" everywhere for the alienation of Jehovah which Israel's prophets in every age had inferred from national calamity, and most of all in the age awakened to its miserable condition by the cry of the Baptist, Repent; for the kingdom is at hand, the kingdom prepared from

the foundation of the world as the inheritance for a righteous people. Paul intentionally makes this prodigious change in the significance of Calvary, and in this process of denationalization he had the intense sympathy of all whose conceptions have come down to us. Even those who stood farthest from him under the leadership of James in Jerusalem counted also on gaining "the residue of mankind." The difference between Paul and "those from James" concerned only the terms of admission for the Gentile contingent. As historians we must reverse the process.

And denationalization was not the only element of change. Paul tells us explicitly of a religious formulation of the message in terms of the Isaian Servant-doctrine which had preceded his own adhesion to the ranks of the brotherhood. This is antecedent to all our records. It pervades them all and is traceable throughout, both in the records of the "anointed" and the descriptions of the suffering Servant. So far as the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins for the Servant's sake is concerned, we see it in our canonical Gospels not on the increase, but on the wane. Matthew, Mark, and Luke retain mere fading vestiges of it in such anecdotes as those of Jesus' silence before Pilate, his burial in the rich man's tomb, the "shame and spitting" he endured. For all these details have point only as fulfilments

of the Servant prophecies; and yet by our evangelists they are brought into no connection with them. "He opened not his mouth," "He made his grave with the rich," "He was delivered up for our sins," "I gave my back to the smiters, I hid not my face from shame and spitting." These are scriptures which would probably have been explicitly referred to in a stage of the tradition infused with a more living interest in the Servant Christology. But they are scarcely discoverable under the surface of our extant Gospels.

On the other hand, three insuperable objections forbid us to suppose that this Servant Christology was taught by Jesus as applying to himself. This idea is still cherished by many, and has much to commend it to our desires; but (1) if Jesus held to it, we cannot explain his protest against his cup of suffering. This is accepted by him solely as due to the inscrutable will of his Father, not because he has a conception of its vicarious value such as Isaiah attributes to the suffering of the Servant. (2) Paul is explicit in ascribing the doctrine to the teaching of "scripture"; he says nothing to connect it with any utterance of Jesus. (3) The writings which have most to say concerning Jesus' martyrdom as fulfilling the predictions of scripture regarding the fate of the Servant, writings such as Luke's Gospel and Acts, and the *Kerygma Petri*, are emphatic in

their corroboration of this inference from Paul. It was not *before* the tragedy that this knowledge came to the disciples. It was *after* it, when their dull hearts were opened to perceive that "thus it behooved the Christ to suffer and (afterward) to enter into his glory." This is insisted upon in primitive apologetic; the disciples did *not* as yet know the Scripture. Such elements of the story as clearly owe their origin to the doctrine of the Servant as applied to particular events must therefore be discounted. They belong to the interpretation of our predecessors, not to the factual data. For the time being we must leave them out of sight. Only the facts and events to which they appear to have been applied must remain in the field of vision.

There is a stage of religious interpretation of the tragedy which is remoter even than the doctrine of the suffering Servant. In fact its basis, though not its ultimate development, appears to be authentic with Jesus himself. It is the apocalyptic or Son-of-Man doctrine. This too has been very ably developed, especially in recent years, by a school of German critics represented most prominently by Schweitzer. It even won for a time such wide assent among English-speaking scholars as perhaps to deserve for the time the epithet the "dominant" explanation. Paul as certainly presupposes a Son-of-Man Christology as he does a Servant Christology—and

with no greater reason for regarding it as based on any teaching of the historic Jesus. The "word of the Lord" which Paul cites to the Thessalonians in support of his apocalyptic eschatology is generally recognized by leading interpreters such as Von Dobschütz and Frame to refer to a "revelation" granted to Christian prophets "in the Spirit," after the manner of our own "Revelation of John." Utterances of the historic Jesus of this apocalyptic type are hard to find.

It cannot indeed be denied that the apocalyptic explanation of Jesus' martyrdom is advanced by Mark. It forms the very essence of the Transfiguration vision, a parallel to the baptismal vision which introduces the Galilean ministry. Both aim to explain to the reader the inward or spiritual sense of the events narrated. Thus the vision granted to Peter and his companions on the holy mount explains the significance of the preceding narrative, the Confession of Jesus as Christ and announcement of the Cross with Rebuke of Peter. From some Jewish-Christian source Mark introduces this account of how the spiritual eyes of Peter and his companions were opened to understand the true character of Jesus as the Son of Man from heaven, and to view his approaching fate as a return to the glory of Paradise where Moses and Elias have their abode

(according to contemporary Jewish belief) awaiting the hour of the "restoration of all things."

In that stage of Christology which is represented by the Son-of-Man doctrine presupposed by Mark, we are undoubtedly carried back to the general belief entertained by the Church in times antecedent to the Epistles of Paul. We are justified by the clear ascription of the title Son of Man to Jesus' own utterance and the connection which is usually given it in the records with his warning of the need to prepare for martyrdom, in inferring that Jesus actually did point to the Danielic figure of the representative of Israel receiving at the heavenly judgment-seat the everlasting kingdom given by the Ancient of days as typical of his own final victory, even should he (and the Twelve) be delivered up to the cross. But are we justified in making the title "Son of Man" Jesus' "favorite self-designation"? Did he court martyrdom after a manner deprecated even by the primitive leaders of the Church themselves? [1] Did he hope thus, as it were, to force the hand of God and secure that kingdom which he despaired of winning by any immanent working of divine redemptive power? Such was his aim in going to meet the cross if we adopt the view of the so-called Eschatological School. To critics

[1] *Martyrdom of Polycarp,* iv.

of this way of thinking, Jesus was a fanatic. His fanaticism is excusable, because characteristic of his age and people. If we call it morbid, its pathological character should apply to the age and environment, not to the individual. The lesson of Jesus' career remains the same; only we must obtain it by subtraction of the ephemeral and local adjuncts. His teaching was only an "interim" ethics, requirements based on "the shortness of the time"; but we can apply them if we treat them as ideals of "other-worldliness," translating them into modern thought-forms. So reason Schweitzer and other eschatologists.

We must do the eschatological critics the justice to recognize that neither the career nor the teaching of Jesus need lose all value to religion even on their interpretation. It would still be possible to find in the story "the power of God unto salvation." Our rejection of the theory is emphatic; but the grounds on which we base this rejection are not religious, but historical.

For three reasons we cannot accept the Son-of-Man Christology as typical of Jesus, nor the apocalyptic eschatology as his distinctive and primary message. (1) The earliest records of his teaching place in contrast his conception of a present sovereignty of God operating through immanent powers, over against the preaching of the Baptist, whose type of

teaching was the more distinctively eschatological of the two. Like all his contemporaries, Jesus did look for a catastrophic wind-up of the age. He expected it within the lifetime of his own contemporaries (Mk. 9:1 and parallels). This was the common presupposition. It concerned the future. Jesus accepts and repeats it as the message of John. What Jesus brought as his personal message had regard to the present. It was "glad tidings" of divine power already at hand, and not for punishment, but for deliverance. (2) His work, both in Galilee and Jerusalem, is as much opposed to the idea of fanaticism as our record of his teaching. He must be judged by what he did as much as by what he said. By neither standard can the theory of the eschatologists be justified. On this score it will be necessary at a later point to present our own conception of his motives in contrast with that of the eschatological school. (3) The effect of Jesus' life and teaching on his own disciples and upon later converts such as Paul can not be accounted for if he himself went to Jerusalem with any such fanatical ambition, leading a band of disciples actuated by similar hopes. The catastrophe could not have been retrieved, as was actually the case. Christianity would not have won the adhesion of men such as Paul, who rather tolerates than advances the Son-of-Man doctrine. And even if Christianity could have survived the

first disappointment of its apocalyptic hopes, it could not, without a deeper root, have survived repeated and prolonged disappointments. The apocalyptic phase of Christian thought was certainly early. For a time it was probably dominant. But the transition made by such leaders as Paul to firmer ground than Jewish apocalypse found a footing in the essential teaching of Jesus. Otherwise it could hardly have won the final assent of the Church. The apocalyptic phase, however large its part in the process of development, was a *phase* of the message, not its essence. This factor too must be discounted when we approach the records with the object of getting at Jesus' own point of view.

The foregoing are examples of discounts which must be made on the score of known or probable adaptation of the records to religious theory. Until such discounts have been made we cannot use them for a strictly historical purpose. Considerations such as these will serve to remove certain premature and inadequate answers already in circulation to the question, Why Jesus went to meet the cross. Paul has denationalized the story. We must reconstruct it with reference to its original national limitations. Paul's predecessors have used similar liberty in giving it their own religious interpretation. They have related it from the standpoint of their own conception of the fulfilment of prophecy. This

is almost certainly the case with regard to the Isaian prophecies of the Servant. We have much evidence that it has also been the case with regard to the Son-of-Man prophecy of Daniel and connected apocalypse. If in place of the idea that this coloration is derived from Jesus personally we substitute that of derivation from the Christological teaching of the pre-Pauline Church, the language of Denney [2] may very well serve to describe the mingling elements of religious adaptation:

> The Son of Man, in the teaching of Jesus (sic), fuses in one person the glorious figure of Daniel, and perhaps of the later book of Enoch, with the suffering servant of the Lord depicted in Isaiah xlii, xlix, liii. This fusion pervades the story of the Gospels more than is sometimes noticed. It comes out at the very beginning of the ministry of Jesus in the account of his baptism. The heavenly voice speaks to him in the words not only of Ps. 2:7, but of Isaiah 42:1; showing that from the very hour when he entered on his work as Saviour he was identified in his own mind (sic) with the suffering servant, and realized that in his calling to bring in the Kingdom of God a career like that of the servant was inevitable.

The passage displays a characteristic transfer to Jesus' "own mind" of the Servant-Christology of primitive Christian thought, not without acute perception of its "fusion" with the Son-of-Man Christology based on Daniel "and perhaps Enoch." There is an element of truth in this idea of the "fusion," because Jesus undoubtedly did adopt the Isaian

[2] *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation,* 1917, p. 139.

ideal *for the mission of Israel.* But for reasons already given it is impossible to suppose that Jesus made the personal identification of himself with the suffering Servant.

In like manner we can heartily admit that Jesus set before the Twelve "the glorious figure of Daniel" when he invited them to share the dangers of his intended appeal to Jerusalem at Passover. Considering the manifest likelihood of catastrophe, we may well question whether their courage would have been equal to the emergency without some such hope set fast in an anchorage within the veil. But the reasons already given make it improbable that the apocalyptic eschatology of Synoptic tradition represents a pure and uncolored transcript of Jesus' message. They quite forbid us to imagine that he identified himself personally with the glorious figure depicted in Daniel and Enoch, or used the title Son of Man as a "favorite self-designation." To make this supposition is to honor the record at the expense of the Master. It is to carry back without historical warrant the Christology of the early believers into an age which as yet had scarcely framed a Christian meaning for the title. The fusion of the two types of Christology is indeed pre-Pauline; but it belongs to the primitive Church rather than to Jesus himself.

Over against these tendencies of the record to em-

phasize unduly factors which seemed to lend support to later Christological views, and to denationalize the story so as to meet the needs of a universal gospel, must be set a tendency of contrary effect. Both to Paul and to the Synoptic evangelists what we have designated the "Son-of-David Christology" is anathema. Matthew and Luke introduce considerable modification of Mark's severe hostility; but the Markan condemnation of any earthly Messiahship still remains fundamental to Synoptic tradition. The prediction of the cross is thrice repeated in Mk. 8:31; 9:30-32 and 10:32-34, always with reference to the correction of the disciples' failure to appreciate its true significance. This dominates Mark's whole account of the *Via crucis*. But if in these predictions we clearly discern the traits of the suffering Servant, including the very phraseology of Isaiah, in spite of the fact that the evangelist's own Christology is of a later, more composite type, we should also do more. We are sadly deficient in applying the principles of historical criticism if we neglect the emphasis of negation. Mark sets the Servant Christology in pronounced and intentional opposition to a Son-of-David Christology, of which in the primary instance Peter, by Satanic suggestion, becomes the spokesman (8:32f.). Doubtless it is not Jewish-Christian, but pure Jewish messianism which Mark has here in mind in applying the re-

buke of the Temptation story, "Get thee behind me, Satan." But many other passages of his Gospel show that he thinks of Peter and the Twelve as blinded and sense-bound by the same πωρώσις as their incredulous fellow-countrymen. The incident of Cæsarea-Philippi merely marks the culmination of their Jewish "hardness of heart." Moreover, the omission of the account of Jesus' Davidic descent, the branding of the idea that such descent is necessary as a mere error of "the scribes" (12:35), the persistent and unrelieved representation of the "kindred" of Jesus, and specifically his "mother and brethren," as resisting him in stubborn unbelief, make it impossible not to ascribe to our Roman evangelist some measure of hostility to Jewish-Christian as well as to purely Jewish messianism. Mark cannot tolerate the Son-of-David Christology. Those who profess it must, to his mind, have their eyes opened like Bartimæus to obtain a higher view. He borrows the very language of Paul to describe the Jewish ideal as "minding not the things of God but of men" (8:33). Mark regards it as a perversion of the true intent of God, worthy of Satan its author. He is not even willing to allow with Paul that "according to the flesh" Jesus might have been "born of the seed of David." At least he maintains that this has no bearing on Jesus' real mission and authority (12:35ff.). He is the Son of God, exalted

to the right hand of heavenly majesty, miraculously manifested as "Christ" by the resurrection. To speak of national messiahship as that promised in the scriptures is to Mark mere Jewish blindness, a perversion due to "the scribes." When Peter voices it he makes himself the mouthpiece of "Satan."

Such is the attitude of that evangelist whose story of the tragedy is almost the sole dependence of the later Synoptists. In Paul we meet an avowed and intentional denationalization and spiritualization of the story, and Paul's universalistic conceptions dominate completely the religious thought of the later Greek-speaking churches. In view of this we could scarcely expect motives of what moderns might designate a "patriotic" character to find expression in the record of Jesus' appeal to the city that he loved and mourned over as the chosen dwelling-place of God. Only a few scraps and fragments of the more native-Jewish point of view survive in Luke and Matthew, more particularly in what is termed the Special Source of Luke. From these alone do we get occasional glimpses into the mind of Jesus as a Jewish patriot. His patriotism was far indeed from the political, desperado type of the Zealots. It was not of the morbid, fanatical, pessimistic type of the apocalyptic eschatologists. It was not of the Pharisaic type of legalistic pietism. But Jesus *was* a

patriot. He shared the ideals and hopes for Israel of the simple Galilean *chasidim*, the men of piety. He had the patriotism of men awakened by the Baptist's call to repentance, uplifted to new faith and hope by the national ideals of Isaiah, and steeled to martyrdom by the memory of Maccabean heroes who gave themselves to fiery torments for the sanctification of Jehovah's name and the triumph of His kingdom.

We have no source of unmixed type to represent this element. In the Q material from which Luke and Matthew have drawn to supplement the story of Mark, the Servant Christology comes more clearly into view. But we shall see as we apply our critical principles to this source also that here too the purely historical interest has yielded to those of religious adaptation. In Q also we find a "fusion" of the Servant and the Son-of-Man Christology, though in different proportion. It is the figure of the Servant which here predominates. But the Servant-figure has the coloration of the Wisdom literature. The theological viewpoint of the Q fragments is that of the incarnation, appeal, rejection, and return of the redeeming spirit of the Wisdom of God. Jesus' career is interpreted from this motive. The point of view differs widely from Mark's. Nevertheless, the comparison is deeply instructive. At least in the form given to this material in the Special Source

of Luke the messianic ideal is fundamentally nationalistic and Jewish-Christian. The author of Lk. 1:68-79 puts in poetic form his ideal of the "redemption" God will effect for his people when he "visits" them. It is to be "a horn of salvation" raised up "in the house of his servant David." God's covenant with Abraham will be remembered. First of all, God will grant "deliverance out of the hand of all our enemies," thereafter, opportunity to "serve Him unmolested in holiness and righteousness all our days." The Baptist was sent, according to this conception, "to go before the face of the Lord" (here properly "the Most High") "to make ready His ways, to give knowledge of salvation to His people in the forgiveness of their sins," to "guide their footsteps into the way of peace."

Had some records survived of the primitive Jewish-Christian church which gathered round the person of James and the kindred of the Lord in Jerusalem, they would doubtless have reflected ideals similar to those expressed in the Song of Zacharias. They do not indeed do justice to the ideals of Jesus. But they are greatly needed to balance accounts against the one-sided view we should obtain if we depended solely on Paul, on Mark, and on Synoptic tradition in its later form. The Jewish-Christian fragments help us to supply the "patriotic" motive, without which it is equally impossible to account

for Jesus' action in assuming the rôle of "the Christ," and for the following which for a time supported his control in Jerusalem in defiance of the temple hierarchy. Even after the tragedy, this following maintained for a full generation, as we know, a kind of caliphate in Jerusalem, claiming for itself a moral leadership over Christianity throughout the world.

Why this Son-of-David Christology so soon disappeared as an effective element in Christian teaching we have already seen. It died because it deserved to; for it did no real justice to the significance of Jesus' teaching and career. But in the reign of Domitian it was still strong enough to provoke a repetition of the intrigue of the Jewish authorities against Jesus. Domitian proved to be less amenable than Pilate to the accusation. Instead of executing James and Zoker, the grandsons of Jude the Lord's brother, cited before the emperor as aspirants to the throne of David whom they claimed as ancestor, even the cruel and suspicious Domitian dismissed them with contempt. But the Jewish-Christian ideal was still a serious opponent in the time of origin of our Gospel of Mark. It calls forth Mark's intense and indignant protest. And Mark is right. Such earthly and nationalistic aims as were encouraged by this view had indeed been responsible for the cross itself, and to it was due such Roman hostility as Jewish hatred could evoke against the Church.

And the political ideal was not only dangerous, but false to historical fact. Jesus did indeed suffer the cross rather than renounce his claim to be "the Christ." If his reported silence before Pilate has any foundation in fact, it can only mean that he refused to defend himself against the accusation that he raised claims to being Israel's hoped-for Deliverer. It is true that Jesus died as "King of the Jews." But the Gospels are certainly justified in their unanimous testimony that he gave the title no political meaning. He did claim it in the sense of aspiring to national leadership. He did regard it as his mission from God to bring his people back to their divine allegiance and vocation. He did mean to carry out the unfinished work of the Baptist in preparing a people repentant and forgiven, ready for the Coming of their King. And when arraigned before Pilate, Jesus had been guilty not only of the intention, but of the overt act. The only sovereignty that the Romans had permitted to remain in Jewish hands was the corrupt hierocracy of the temple, rich, cruel, irreligious, notoriously using their place to enrich themselves and intrigue with the alien power which had given them their authority. For a few short days Jesus defied the power of the Sanhedrin and held them cowed by the strength of his popular support. He had chosen a method of beginning national reform which could

be carried through without bloodshed. If Roman intervention were not evoked, it might carry into actual effect the Baptist's ideal of a nation purified by repentance, reconsecrated to Jehovah in the national "house of prayer." But the later Jewish hierocracy had never shown reluctance to resort to alien support. Least of all would it be characteristic of "the hissing brood of Annas," or the puppet Caiaphas his son-in-law, not to secure Roman intervention if they could do so without danger to their personal authority. Jesus did go up to Jerusalem to assume national leadership and control. He did go open-eyed to the danger, and with full warning to his followers. He did intend to challenge the corrupt hierocracy in control of his "Father's house"; because there was no other way open for the carrying out of his patriotic purpose. He gave himself for the cause he put first in the prayer he taught his disciples. He "sanctified himself" that Jehovah's name might be sanctified at the national house of worship, and God's eternal sovereignty be established in "the city of the Great King."

If we speak of the motive of Jesus as "patriotic" it is only for the sake of counteracting the denationalizing tendency of our sources and restoring the historical atmosphere existent when as yet the message was addressed only to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." Were we to neglect the Isaian character

of the ideal in view, so emphasized (in some respects over-emphasized) in early phases of the Servant doctrine, we should commit the same injustice against Jesus as did Jewish Christianity. The only leadership Jesus sought at Jerusalem was such as might enable him to bring Israel back to its God-given mission in the world. And he did not conceive that mission in a political sense. The later development of the Servant doctrine had an authentic root in his teaching. Conversely, were we to neglect the Danielic element so strongly emphasized (in most cases over-emphasized) after his death, we should again commit a historical error. Jesus did not use the title Son of Man to direct attention to his own claims, or even to mystify his hearers. The imputation of such megalomaniac dreams does injustice to his complete and simple trust in God. But we should do him a deeper injustice if we refused to him in some true and adequate sense the title of Messiah, in defense of which he laid down his life. Jesus did claim to be "the Christ." To deny this is to deny his response to the call for national leadership. He did feel himself responsible for the "little flock" to whom the Father had decreed the kingdom, and he had faith to believe it would be given to the representative of that flock at the judgment-seat of the Ancient of Days. He did feel himself to be God's "anointed." He would not otherwise have

gone to meet the cross. What special purpose he conceived this "anointing" to subserve must be determined by his actual course.

It is part of the denationalizing, theologizing tendency we have been seeking to counteract that it obscures the significance of the events of controlling influence in the drama by elaborating incidental details when they lend themselves to the particular didactic purpose immediately in view. Such are the agglomerated stories of Mk. 10, grouped to illustrate the theme Leaving All for the Gospel's Sake. Such is the description of the so-called Royal Entry into Jerusalem. The story is ignored at the trial, and is explicitly recognized in the version of Jn. 12:12-16 as an incident which *at the time* was disregarded. It was only recalled "after Jesus was glorified" as "fulfilling the scripture." A mere didactic application, again, is Mark's version of The Barren Fig-tree, which in Lk. 13:6-9 appears in the form of a *parable* of unrepentant Israel. Such is also the allegorizing Parable of the Usurping Husbandmen, which in Mk. 12:1-11 makes specific application of the Wisdom plaint of Jehovah's messengers sent to the city stained with the blood of prophets (Mt. 23:34-39=Lk. 11:49-51; 13:34f.; cf. Prov. 1:20-31). Such again is the group of altercations in Mk. 12:13-40, in which after answering successively the (typical) questions of Pharisee,

Sadducee, and scribe, Jesus closes debate with an unanswerable question voicing Christian belief. Such is the appended Denunciation of the Scribes (including the curious digression of the Widow's Mites apparently inserted apropos of the charge that the scribes "devour widows' houses"). Such is finally the Eschatological Chapter (13) predicting the Doom of Jerusalem. These additions are important enough as examples of early Christian teachings based upon the story, but their elaboration tends rather to obscure the real dramatic outline of interconnected events. The real historic sequence passes directly from the Purging of the Temple (11:11, 15-18) to the Sanhedrin's Challenge of Jesus' Authority (11:27-33) and the plot against his life (14:1-11). Here cause and effect are inseparably linked. Given the act of insurgency on the part of the "prophet," the reaction of the "brood of Annas" was as sure to follow as the night the day.

None of our evangelists can fairly be accused of minimizing the significance of Jesus' act in purging the temple. Disregard of this is a fault of purely modern times. We must grant that the ancient writers do their utmost to deprecate the attachment to it of any *political* significance. We must even grant that when (as in John) they desire especially to bring out the fact that the purification was in its essential nature a public act by which Jesus assumed

leadership of the nation, they do not hesitate at displacement. But none of the Gospels is guilty of omitting this act, or of treating it as of anything less than cardinal importance and significance as a token to Israel of Jesus' mission. In point of fact, it was his method of raising the standard of reform. Every prophet in Israel's history had availed himself of similar symbolic methods. No other than the method of appeal to the nation by symbolic act was in fact available in ancient times.

If, then, the question be raised of Jesus' purpose in going to Jerusalem, it must be answered quite simply from what he actually did. He did not go there *in order* to be crucified, but to fulfill his mission to Israel *in spite of* the menace of the cross. He went up to claim his Father's house as a house of prayer for all Israel. To invert here purpose and result is equally misleading, whether it take the form of ancient apologetic, seeking to prove fulfillment of the Servant prophecies, or of modern psychology bent on clothing Jesus in the garment of an apocalyptic fanatic. The object Jesus had in view was an act of national significance. And Mark is more true to fact in implying that Jesus reconnoitered the field before his *coup d'état* (Mk. 11:11) than the later evangelist (Matthew) who obliterates this little historical trait. The deliberate intention of Jesus is no less clear from the marvelous wisdom

of his choice of the field of battle than from the correspondence of the issue drawn with the interests which we know were vital to him. On these two points a few further words of explanation may be required.

1. The temple was one of the strongest fortresses and richest banks of Syria. It had an elaborate system of temple police, specially reënforced at the Passover season. The "captain of the temple" (*sagen*) commanded a sufficient force to control any ordinary disturbance, and could be reënforced in any emergency by the Roman garrison in the adjoining fortress of the Antonia. But as already explained, and as epigraphic evidence completely proves, Rome consented, on grounds of general policy regarding matters of religion, to leave control within this narrow precinct in the hands of the Jewish hierocracy, nominally a native succession, though Annas and Caiaphas were really Roman appointees. To carry through a reform of abuses, however exasperating, in defiance of priesthood and Sanhedrin under such conditions as these would be impossible without overwhelming popular support. Once accomplished, the issue between prophet and hierocracy could not be left quiescent for a term of years. As between beginning and end of Jesus' career, it is as easy to see the necessity of placing the purification at a time when he had the maximum of

Galilean support, as to see why on doctrinal grounds the fourth evangelist should place it where he does. For this writer assumes that Jesus presented himself openly as Messiah from the outset. As regards Jesus' choice of this particular battle-ground, it is clear that a religious reformer could hardly present a *national* appeal without the gravest danger of political intervention, violence, and bloodshed, unless advantage were taken of the special provision made in this case by Roman authority for religious independence. *In the temple* the Jews were their own masters.

2. To appreciate all aspects of the undertaking, the motive of Jesus in planning this particular act, its significance to current patriotic sentiment, the dangers to which it exposed all participants, and the effect which even failure would have upon the popular mind, two instances may be adduced from Jewish literature and history, substantially contemporary. One is a rabbinic comment on the title "Tent of Witness" applied to the sanctuary in Exodus. The comment is of special value in this case because it employs the two prophecies which seem to have been most influential with John the Baptist and Jesus, Malachi's summons of Israel to purification, especially the purification of *priesthood and temple*, as the condition of Jehovah's return in mercy; and Isaiah's figure of Israel's widowhood

until Jehovah is "reconciled to her." We may take first this rabbinic explanation of the name "Tent of Witness" to show what might be the feeling of devout Israelites in Jesus' time toward a prophet who should seek to purify Jehovah's house, cast out the mercenary crew who had degraded its worship into robbery of the poor, and make it again "a house of prayer for all the people" according to Jeremiah's hope.

The comment (*Ex. R.* ch. 51) is in the form of a parable combining the imagery of Is. 50:1; 62:4f. and Mal. 1:6-14; 3:1-12.

> A certain king was angry with his wife and forsook her. The neighbors (Gentiles) declared, He will not return. Then the king sent word to her: "Cleanse my palace, and on such and such a day I will return to thee." So he came and was reconciled to her. Therefore is the Sanctuary called the Tent of Witness. It is a "witness" to the Gentiles that God is no longer wroth.

With this it is worth while to compare Jesus' answer to the delegation from "the chief priests and elders and scribes" (the Sanhedrin), demanding his authority for doing these things. It will be noticed that he makes his work a continuation of that of John:

> I also will ask of you one question, and answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism (reform movement) of John, was it from heaven, or of men? Answer me.

The evangelist's comment is justified. "They were afraid to answer, fearing the people, for all verily held John to be a prophet." Mark is far behind the older Q material in doing justice to Jesus' reverence for John and his divine mission; but he has at least preserved here something indicative of Jesus' conception of his own mission as fulfilling that of his high-souled predecessor. In purifying his Father's house to make it a house of prayer for all the people, Jesus was bringing to its true culmination the work which he had taken up "after John was cast into prison."

For John's work was far from complete until Israel had found uniting leadership for its "return." To Jesus the greatness of John was that (like Elijah) he had been sent "to turn Israel's heart back again" (I Kings 18:37). John was supremely great because this "repentance" (turning back again) was the last. It was the great turning of the heart of the Father (God) to the children (Israel) and the children to the Father which, as Malachi had declared (in the reading followed in Ecclus. 48:10), must ensue if the great Day of Jehovah were not to smite the earth with a curse. Jesus' thought in taking up the unfinished work of the prophet is concentrated on the need of "gathering the scattered sheep." Those whom he summons to help are invited to use their nets to bring together these help-

less strays. He himself looks with compassion on the leaderless multitude "as sheep without a shepherd." To have dropped his work after he was driven out of Galilee, to have left Jerusalem to its fate, to have consented to be silenced or go to alien peoples, was not what we should expect of Jesus. To begin a new, a larger, a more intense and a more dangerous ministry at Jerusalem was for him a mission "from heaven." And if he was to make his appeal to all Israel, there was no such way of prophetic symbolism as this—to restore the house of Jehovah to a spiritual worship, to "purify the palace" of the Great King.

3. An incident related by Josephus of the days immediately preceding the death of Herod the Great will show from a very different angle what temple purification could mean to a body of devotees ready to give their lives to cross or flame "for the sanctification of the Name." The story awakens but little interest among moderns because of its broad differences from the act of Jesus and his little band of followers consecrated to death, when, with the support of the Galilean multitude, they set the priestly control at defiance to make God's house a house of prayer for the whole people. We shall take full account of these differences; but the story should be adduced for the sake of what it meant to devout and patriotic Jews of Jesus' time.

The chief actors in the story are a Galilean rabbi, Judas son of Sepphoræus (apparently a native of Sepphoris near Nazareth), and another not otherwise known, who likewise bears the same name as one of the Twelve, Matthias son of Margalus. These two rabbis took the opportunity, when Herod appeared to be at the point of death, to incite a group of the "young men" who were their followers and disciples "to defend the cause of God" by pulling down the golden eagle which Herod had erected over the great gate of the temple. This was interpreted by the scribes as "contrary to the laws of their country." The flat violation of the second Commandment obviously called forth a flame of indignation only second to that which had kindled the ardor of Maccabean patriots to remove "the abomination that maketh desolate," and was soon to rekindle it when Caius sought to repeat the sacrilege of Antiochus. The rabbis told their young followers that

> it was a glorious thing to die for the laws of their country, *because immortality of soul and eternal enjoyment of happiness would await those that died so.*

At midday "when a great number of people were in the temple," on whose support the insurgents could rely, the young men cut down the golden eagle with axes. About forty were seized by the temple guard and brought to the dying Herod, who de-

manded by what authority they had acted. They replied that it was "at the command of the law of their country."

> And when he further asked how they could be so jubilant when they were to be put to death, they replied: Because they would enjoy greater happiness after they were dead.

Alien though he was, Herod thoroughly understood the management of a Jewish mob. He summoned his fast-ebbing strength, went out to the multitude, and accused the insurgents of sacrilege in the first instance, but also (what is likely enough) that they had made a pretext of defending the Law to foment insurrection. The effect of Herod's speech furnishes an interesting parallel to that of Pilate:

> Thereupon the people were afraid lest a great number should be found guilty, and begged that when he had first punished those that had suggested this work, and then those that were caught at it, he would leave off his anger as to the rest.

Judas and Matthias, together with all who had actively participated in the cutting down of the eagle, were burnt alive. The rest of the prisoners escaped death only by the happy chance of Herod's own decease, when sympathizers obtained amnesty for them.

The story will at least serve to show what kind of danger Jesus and the Twelve confronted when

they set their faces stedfastly to go up to Jerusalem, and why Jesus appealed to more than any earthly reward when he bade them go as men who bear their own crosses on their shoulders. Nothing is more difficult than to say in just how literal a sense Jesus appealed to the Danielic prophecy in which Israel's representative, "one like unto a son of man," receives from the heavenly King at the eternal judgment-seat the "kingdom that shall not pass away." Nothing to the present writer seems historically surer than that Jesus did hold this scene of heavenly triumph before his followers' eyes. Whether Judas and Matthias did the like for their martyred followers we can only surmise. Certain it is that those who died "to defend the cause of God" did so in the confident assurance that God would also defend their cause. If, then, we ask why the terror-stricken group of Galileans led by Peter, who had fled "every man to his own home" after the blow had fallen on the Shepherd, could be so quickly rallied even through the testimony of "visions and revelations of the Lord," current martyrology supplies an answer. It should be remembered that the young men who went to their death with Judas and Matthias went in the confidence not of a far-off return from Sheol in the general resurrection at the end of the world, but of an immediate immortality, an expectation to be that very day in Paradise together with

Enoch and Moses and Elias, and with the soul of Messiah that is laid up there ready to be manifested in the great Day of Jehovah, together with the two witnesses "who stand in the presence of the Lord of the whole earth."

The great difference between the temple purification of Judas and Matthias and the temple purification of Jesus is, first, that the defilement in the former case was only ritual and ceremonial, whereas Jesus sought to remove everything that had changed the Father's house from a house of prayer for all Israel and for those afar off into "a den of thieves." It was, as we shall more fully realize after a study of the earlier ministry, the logical capstone to a work of restoration of his people's right relation to God, the "reconciliation" between them and their King. Secondly, Jesus' act was not "a pretext for insurrection." It had indeed popular support for the time being, but that waned as fast as Jesus made known the purely religious object in view. And he made no secret of his complete lack of sympathy for Zealot agitation. He lifted not a finger against Roman control. No Pharisee could more completely wash his hands of anything that did not concern "the things that are God's." Pilate might do as he would with his garrison in the tower of Antonia. Jesus demanded only that the "house of prayer" be no longer dominated by the corrupt and godless

hierarchy of Annas and Caiaphas. Moderns dismiss, perhaps with too much of the hard and unsympathetic spirit of the narrator Josephus, the martyr fate of Judas and Matthias and their band of young devotees, because it strikes us only as an instance of "Jewish fanaticism." And such it is. So far as it was prepared for by a campaign of education, this revolt of Matthias probably did not rise above the level of a religio-patriotic propaganda. So far as it made a popular appeal, it did not look beyond the ideal of Judas Maccabæus; "to be delivered out of the hand of all our foes, so that we might worship Jehovah without fear in holiness and righteousness all our days." But when we infuse the act of temple purification with a loftier aim, making it what Jesus made it, the act which brought him to the cross takes on a larger, a more than national significance. It had been prepared for by a campaign to turn Israel to repentance in fulfilment of the work of John, to effect the Reconciliation visioned by Isaiah. "Fanaticism" is a term that under such conditions no longer applies. The event becomes the climax of Israel's witness to the world. The national ideal is merged in the universal. The work becomes such a symbol as John sees in it, a token of the building of the new temple of the body of Christ, the destruction of the limited and partial that the eternal, world-wide, and spiritual may remain.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE COVENANT SUPPER

WE have found the roots of the doctrine of the Atonement bedded deep in the most ancient observance of the Church. To Paul its essence is "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," and his assurance of this immortal love is found in a rite which could not be questioned or doubted, because he had it by unbroken transmission "from the Lord" himself. He undoubtedly individualizes, in accordance with his habitual method of passage from national to universal terms, when he declares, "He loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*." But who, that accepts Paul's principle that the drama of redemption was meant by God's providence to have more than national significance, will question Paul's right to make this personal application of the words, "This is my body, my blood, which is given for you"? We have just seen in what spirit of devotion to the cause taken over from the Baptist Jesus had gone up to Jerusalem. We have now to follow the story to its conclusion, taking note of all variation in the record; for while accounts are many, they

are also varied. It could scarcely fail to be so in a case of testimony repeated from the beginning, constantly, in every church, and with continual re-adaptation to various religious needs and occasions.

From a very early date, certainly not later than 54-55, when Paul writes our so-called "Second" letter to the Corinthians (in reality his fourth), the memorial Supper had come to be spoken of as the "Covenant" in the blood of the Christ, or, with more or less explicit reference to the prophetic ideal of Jeremiah (Jer. 31:31-34), the "new," or the "eternal," covenant in the blood of the great Shepherd of the sheep. In II Cor. 3:6ff. Paul makes merely passing reference to this contrast, placing the covenant of Moses, who at Sinai obtained only a provisional code of law to form the basis of new relations between Jehovah and the guilty people, over against the "new covenant" of Christ, which brought "life" and "the ministration of the Spirit." Moses had merely prefigured this "new covenant" when he brought down from the mount, after his intercession with God for the people's sin, a first "gospel of Reconciliation."

The author of the great Memorial Oration known to us as The Epistle to the Hebrews elaborates this Pauline conception of the "new covenant," using even the secondary sense of the word (testament) and pointing out that the fruits of the sacrifice were

a kind of dying "bequest" of Jesus (9:16ff.). The "testament" had, as it were, been sealed with his blood. Pulpit oratory should not, of course, be taken in the same sense as sober, dispassionate narrative, and even Paul's own references in II Corinthians are suffused with deep emotion. But this emotion itself is significant, while the comparison of the covenant of Jesus with that related in Exodus shows how its makers have taken for their model the sublime ideal of Jeremiah. To these primitive Christians the Supper was a "new covenant" of real and complete forgiveness. It involved a "new commandment," but a commandment written not on tables of stone, but in hearts of flesh.

Superior historically as is Paul's account of the Supper as he had "received and transmitted it by tradition" (παρέλαβον, παρέδωκα, I Cor. 11:23) to any recorded in our Gospels, consideration must also be given to the divergent forms incorporated by our evangelists. For Paul himself makes it apparent that a rival conception was prevalent in Corinth. He also shows something of the nature of the difference; for he makes it clear that to his mind the wrong tendencies in Corinthian observance were due to the fact that his converts in their joyful feasting failed adequately to "discriminate the Lord's body." In short, their sense of coming benefits for themselves threatened to eclipse their sense of gratitude

and devotion to the Leader who had won deliverance for all at the cost of his life. The Pauline emphasis on the lesson of the cross and on the indispensableness of the moral "fruits of the Spirit" is unmistakable. This may to some extent justify the demand on the part of critics that Paul's account of what Jesus said and did shall not be understood as aiming to present the whole truth in even proportion, so much as to supply particular elements which the Corinthians were in danger of forgetting.

Comparison with other sources will also enable us to form a fairly reliable idea of the sense given to the observance by those whom Paul was rebuking. For ancient liturgies of the Church, as well as some elements of the Gospels themselves, show the same characteristic disposition to regard the rite as looking more to the Kingdom than to the Cross, the bread and wine betokening not so much the broken body of the victim as the heavenly banquet now brought close in view. In the Διδαχή we have a non-Pauline, perhaps a Petrine, source. It is an early second-century document, probably of north-Syrian, perhaps of Antiochian, derivation. Here the prayers of thanksgiving over bread and wine have solely to do with the reunion of the new people of God under their exalted Messiah in his kingdom. The bread symbolizes "the gathering together of the elect in the Kingdom," even as the grain once "scattered on

the mountains" had been "gathered together into the one loaf." The wine symbolizes not so much the outpoured blood of Jesus as "the holy vine of thy servant David (Ps. 80), which thou madest known unto us through thy Servant Jesus." God is thanked for "life and immortality" and for "knowledge and faith." He is acknowledged as the Giver of food and drink both bodily and spiritual. The Lord is entreated:

> Remember thy Church to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in thy love, and gather it together from the four winds, even her that hath been sanctified for thy kingdom which thou didst prepare for her.

But from beginning to end, there is no mention of the suffering of Jesus or of the cross or of the forgiveness of sins. The wholly joyful character of the observance is particularly noticeable in the Thanksgiving after the Supper (ch. x).

As against a predominantly festive note such as this, Paul would dwell mainly in the observance on the thought of Jesus as the suffering Servant of Isaiah, by whose stripes and intercession believers obtain forgiveness and new life. This theme was unquestionably present at the beginning in the Petrine gospel also which preceded Paul's. It is conspicuous in First Peter. In the *Didaché*, Petrine though it is in the geographical sense, this feature has faded almost completely out of view. All that

remains is the bare title the beloved *Servant*, which is bestowed on Jesus in this and a few kindred passages directly drawn from the liturgy. The phenomenon is paralleled in the Gospel and Acts of Luke, where the primitive title survives in four passages only (Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30), all of them utterances of Peter or prayers of the Church. At the same time, as we have had frequent occasion to note, the doctrine of forgiveness through the blood of the cross has disappeared absolutely from Luke's pages.

The difference between this relatively late Syrian or Petrine point of view and Paul's conception of the Supper is not conscious or intentional, but is none the less significant. We must turn to the Gospels for further light upon it, noting that our earliest canonical record, that of Mark, represents oral tradition at Rome; and this, though ultimately derived from Peter, comes to us through channels which, if not directly colored by Pauline teaching, are at least thoroughly anti-Jewish in feeling. Over against this Roman tradition stands the Q material of Matthew and Luke, one important factor of which (Lk. 22:23, 30=Mt. 19:28) lies embedded in Luke's account of the Supper. Comparison of textual data proves that the shorter or Western form of the Lukan text is alone authentic, the addition in Lk. 22:19b-20 being drawn from I Cor. 11:25. The purpose of the addition is apparent from the authentic remainder. This Lukan

Supper-narrative appears to be drawn from a source employed by Mark also, of which the Q element of Matthew formed part. We shall have to place in comparison first of all the "covenant" passages of Q and Mark. Therefore it may be necessary to bring into the comparison the changes effected by later evangelists, taking as our standard the characteristic note of Paul as he himself enables us to trace it in his own letters by an emphatic differentiation from certain modes of observance which he seeks to correct. The tracing back of this divergence between Petrine and Pauline tradition in the observance of the Supper is of vital importance to our inquiry, but it will require us to journey somewhat afield.

The present writer in his *Beginnings of Gospel Story* (1909), followed, in 1920, by further developments in *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?,* has attempted to show that in Mark the story of the institution of the Supper has been affected by Western and Roman practice, altering the sense of the underlying Petrine tradition as respects datings, and thus bringing both Mark itself and the dependent Gospels of Luke (in the later, Alexandrian form of the text) and Matthew into conflict with the datings of the Fourth Gospel. Whatever the cause, a certain anti-Jewish coloration appears in Mark, and must be allowed for. As regards eucharistic datings, it is the conviction of a large and growing number of

critics of widely differing schools that the Ephesian Gospel alone still represents unchanged the Pauline and apostolic time of observance, which conformed to the ancient Jewish festal calendar. The Church in the East (where to this day the luni-solar calendar is in use, compelling observers of annual festivals to shift their dates according to the phases of the moon) continued for centuries to observe "the day when the (Jewish) people put away the leaven" (of the old year), that is Nisan 14, as the annual feast of redemption through the victory of Jesus over the powers of the underworld. The cross became the symbol of this victory and replaced the lance of St. George or Michael in representations of the transfixing of the dragon. The third day from this great day of the Preparation of Passover was the sixteenth Nisan, or First-fruits according to the law as laid down in Lev. 23:15. In Paul's time it also was widely observed by Christians. We know it still as "the Lord's day" of weekly observance. It was probably at first an *annual* commemoration of the exaltation, when Christ "our Passover" had become the First-fruits of them that slept (I Cor. 5:7ff.; 15:4, 20, 23). If so, this *annual* continuation of the Jewish feast of First-fruits was soon lost in a *weekly* observance of Sunday as the resurrection day; for the disappearance of the annual feast could only be expedited by the quarrel of the Jewish calendar authorities over the interpretation of

Lev. 23:15, conservative and Sadducean practice holding that "sabbath" in the phrase "on the morrow after the sabbath" must apply to the festival rest-day (sabbath) constituted in the law itself (Lev. 23:7f.) on Nisan 15, the first day of Unleavened Bread. The Pharisees, contrariwise, insisted (apparently from about 50 A.D.) that it applied to that particular seventh day of the week which should happen to fall next after Nisan 14. In the older Sadducean, as in Christian, practice, Pentecost would fall invariably on the first day of the week.

What had happened to the commemoration of the Exaltation happened later to the commemoration of the Resurrection. Not only did the observance of Sunday displace that of First-fruits shortly after Paul's time, but in the West (which followed the Julian calendar and found it in many ways both irksome and distasteful to celebrate the Christian feast of redemption coincidently with that of the hated Jews) it was early decreed sacrilegious to celebrate Easter "on any other than the Lord's day." Thus by 150 A.D. East and West were in sharp controversy. The East claimed the authority of Paul in Corinthians, and of a practice which they dated back to "John" and others who had seen the Lord or had direct connection with the Apostles. The West appealed to "Matthew," which, as we now know, depends on Mark, but was cited in preference to Mark as being "apostolic."

Matthew, following Mark, clearly identifies the last supper with the Jewish Passover, and makes the crucifixion take place on the next day (a Friday by all accounts) and the resurrection on "the first day of the week." Only the Ephesian Gospel retains the practice represented in I Cor. 5:8ff.; 15:4, 20, 23. This Gospel dates by days of the month as well as of the week, making the crucifixion coincide with the slaying of the lamb on the *Preparation* of Passover (Nisan 14) and the resurrection with First-fruits (Nisan 16).

The strength of the plea for Quartodeciman practice, and for the Ephesian Gospel as more nearly representing the historic date, lies in the implications of Mark itself. For this Gospel and its satellites really demand datings coincident with the Fourth Gospel by the intrinsic requirement of the story as related. It is highly improbable that the hierocracy, after taking pains to anticipate Passover in order not to provoke "a tumult of the people," should after all have seized and executed their victim on that very day. Again, the session of the Sanhedrin on this day would have been at least illegal, not to say impossible. Again, the description of the Supper entirely differs from the elaborate ritual of the Passover, which, among other requirements, strictly forbids all participants to go out from the door of the house until the morning; whereas Jesus and the Twelve eat leavened bread (ἄρτος) and after the simple meal go out to Bethany.

In a host of ways the story itself, even in Mark, shows plainly that the Passover had not yet begun, but only its "sanctification" (*kiddush*), and that the slight touches by which in Mark the supper has been made an actual Passover feast are editorial.

Whether the explanation given above of the difference be correct or not, it may be set down as more probable historically that the Fourth evangelist and the Quartodecimans of the second century are in the right on this seemingly unimportant question of date. Mark and its satellites have been misled by a desire to make the Supper take the place of the Jewish Passover, the change being made possible by a failure on the part of Mark to distinguish between the ceremony of "sanctification" (Kiddush) of Passover celebrated on the Preparation, or day before the feast, and the feast itself. The difference might indeed seem unimportant, but is of real significance for our understanding of the symbolism, to say nothing of its bearing on the reliability of Synoptic tradition.

The Kiddush is a rite performed by the head of every Jewish household on the eve of every Sabbath (hence on Friday or "Preparation day") and of every religious feast. A transcript of the description of the rite from the article "Kiddush" in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* will show how much more closely its simple ritual corresponds with the story of the Supper than the elaborate ceremonial of Passover,

with its five ritual cups, its bitter sauce, its unleavened cakes (*mazzoth*) instead of "bread" (ἄρτος), and the roasted flesh of the Passover lamb.

The Kiddush for the Sabbath is made up of two benedictions: that for the wine (or bread, when wine is not used) and that for the day. Following the opinion of Hillel's school that for the wine is said first: Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King of the world, Creator of the *fruit of the vine*. . . . After reciting the Kiddush the *master of the house* sips from the cup and then passes it to his wife and the others at the table; then all *wash their hands*, and the *master of the house* blesses the bread, cuts it, and passes a morsel to each person at the table.

It seems to be quite without consciousness of any resemblance to Christian rites or Gospel phraseology that the Jewish scholar Dembitz presents the above description, in which we have italicised certain elements which for their phraseology, or other coincidence with Gospel story (as in the washing of hands; cf. Jn. 13:4ff.), seemed worthy of emphasis. As he tells us, the Kiddush consists of "benedictions" (for which the Greek term would be "thanksgivings" or "eucharists"). The thanksgiving for the cup is marked by the phrase "this fruit of the vine." There were varieties of practice, and these coincide with such as are known in early Christian observance. In some regions the thanksgiving for the cup came before the bread (cf. Lk. 22:17ff. and *Didaché* ix.), in others the reverse order was followed (cf. Mk. 14:22; Mt. 26:26). In some cases, wine was not used.

Christians also had the same variation in the observance of the eucharist, some using water only. The thanksgiving for the holy day now beginning (the Jewish day begins at sunset), and the action taken by Jesus with relation to the guests at his table, as "Master of the house" (cf. Mt. 10:25; Jn. 13:12-16), completes the picture. When we realize the cogency of the reasons for accepting the testimony of the fourth evangelist that the scene was that of the *eve* of Passover, when the rite of the Kiddush must be observed, it will be easy to understand why in connection with the eucharist, as Christians still observe it, Jesus (in Luke's form of the story) expresses the longing (destined to remain unfulfilled) that he might eat this (coming) Passover with the Twelve before he should suffer. On the question of date, at least, the (uninterpolated) Lukan form of the story of the Supper must, therefore, be preferred historically to Mark's.

While the symbolism of Passover, Israel's Redemption feast, is involved, since the Kiddush was a thanksgiving for the festal day, and a sanctification or consecration of it, the fact that it was this comparatively simple ritual which suggested to Jesus his farewell parable will be of value to us in the attempt to determine its most vital meaning. Whether, with Paul, we should lay chief emphasis on the sacrificial love embodied in the utterance "given for you," or

whether (with those whose festive mode of observance Paul deprecates) we should think of Jesus as having mainly in view the great redemption banquet of the Kingdom, at which he and the Twelve would meet again ("Ye shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom"), is a question to which only a comparison of Paul's with the Synoptic record can supply an answer. But first of all, the Synoptic record itself must be more closely scrutinized.

We may practically dismiss from consideration Matthew's account, which offers nothing more than a transcript of Mark, modified by the transfer of the clause "for the forgiveness of sins" from its connection with the baptism of John in Mk. 1:4 to a connection better suited, in Matthew's view, to its significance. The change furnishes an interesting parallel to the fourth evangelist's denial of any saving significance to John's baptism, and his pointing to "the Lamb of God" as "taking away the sin of the world"; but for our present purpose, Matthew's slight alteration of Mark has no significance.

We shall find value, however, in a further comparison of Mark on the one side with Paul, on the other with Luke, both in the more authentic "Western" form of Luke's text and in that which, for reasons doubtless similar to those which actuate Mark, have led his "Alexandrian" transcribers to interpolate in

Lk. 22:19b-20 an extract from I Cor. 11:25. The original, *uninterpolated* Lukan text when studied by itself will be found highly unique and instructive. When this section of Luke, derived from that Special Source which seems to have served him better than Mark for most of his passion narrative, and which embodies as its central feature one fragment known also to Matthew, is placed in comparison with the ritual of the *Didaché*, we shall have before us the two types on which our judgment must be based. *The complete absence from the authentic Lukan text of any trace of the doctrine of forgiveness of sin on account of the suffering or sacrifice of the Servant* is its most striking feature. It shares this characteristic, as we have seen, with all other portions of the Lukan writings and with the liturgy of the *Didaché*. If, as we have reason to suppose, this material of Luke employed by him in common with Matthew (Q) was also known to Mark, we shall have an explanation both of Mark's relative neglect of this source (which may have been objectionable to him as Jewish-Christian) and of his modification of its story of the Supper to introduce the vital features of Paul's doctrine. Mark's course will be paralleled by that of the "Alexandrian" transcribers of Luke's text, who seem to have felt it imperative to introduce the teaching of Paul.

One more item of evidence requires consideration

before we proceed to compare the variant forms of the tradition of the Covenant Supper. As already noted, the fourth evangelist makes clear his conviction that this was not the Passover, but the usual evening meal, which on the evening preparatory to the Passover was preceded by prayers of consecration of the (leavened) bread and the wine, the ordinary constituents of the meal. The ceremony was performed by "the master of the house," and was followed by a ceremonial washing of hands, after which the repast proceeded. It was called the "sanctification" (Kiddush) of Passover, because the prescribed "benedictions" consecrated both the elements and the festal day. As is well known, the fourth (Ephesian) evangelist has obliterated all trace of connection with the Passover from his story of the farewell supper, transferring to the previous Passover occasion, that of the Feeding of the Multitude in Galilee (Jn. 6), his interpretation of the significance of the Eucharist as a metaphorical eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of the Son of Man. This leaves him free to interpret the farewell supper in Jerusalem purely as a "consecration" (*kiddush*) of the Church and of Jesus himself as the true Passover. Accordingly the closing feature of the story is the so-called "high-priestly" prayer before Jesus goes forth to his fate, a prayer of "consecration" of himself (17:17-19) and his followers, and of inter-

cession on their behalf (cf. Lk. 22-31f.). In the liturgy of the *Didaché* also the prayer over the cup (above p. 248) makes "the Church" the object of "sanctification." Here the Thanksgiving for "the fruit of the vine" is a Thanksgiving "for the holy vine of thy servant David (referring to Ps. 80:8ff.) which thou hast made known unto us through thy Servant Jesus." Its place is taken in Jn. 15 by the Parable of the Vine of Christ, beginning, "I am the true Vine and my Father is the husbandman." The only mention of bread and wine in John's version of the supper is the sop given to Judas, a kind of Satanic antithesis to the sacrament as related in the Synoptic form. But the ablution after beginning the meal is made a prominent feature. Instead of a washing of *hands,* as in the Kiddush ceremonial, Jesus testified the nature of his own love, and set the example of it for the future conduct of his disciples, by a symbolic act which for this evangelist gives central significance, if not the only significance, to the Supper.

> Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he came forth from God and goeth unto God, riseth from supper, and layeth aside his garments; and he took a towel and girded himself. Then he poureth water into the bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded.

The substitution of feet for hands belongs to the symbolism of the nuptial ablution referred to in Eph.

5:26,[1] and is clearly intended (cf. verses 6-10) to emphasize the lesson *ministrare non ministrari,* which is made equally prominent in the Lukan account, but by different means (cf. Lk. 22:24-27). The lesson drawn is that this action of "your Lord and Teacher" should perpetually symbolize the law of ministering love, the bond of perfectness in the body of the disciples.

Of the other characteristic features of the farewell Supper as described by the Ephesian evangelist, it is needless to speak. What has already been adduced should suffice to show that he views the occasion (consistently with his peculiar system of dating) as symbolizing the Consecration (Kiddush) of the Passover, in which Jesus himself is to become both priestly Intercessor and saving Victim. The teaching of the body and blood of the Christ "given for the life of the world" is advanced by John, as we have seen, to a previous occasion, that of an actual Passover (Jn. 6:4). At the farewell supper this evangelist has nothing not appropriate to the Kiddush, or Consecration of Passover. The data seem even to have been suggested by its ritual. At the same time John has contrived to make his account combine the Pauline lesson of fellowship in the sufferings of Christ

[1] See R. Eisler, "Zur Fusswaschung am Tage vor dem Passah" in *ZNW,* XIV, 3 (1913), p. 268 ff. Eisler quotes Servius (*Aen.* IV. 167) as to the nuptial rite: "nubentibus solebant pedes lavari."

(15:11ff.) with the Petrine of the hope of glory (15:1-10).

If we now return to a comparison of the north-Syrian or Petrine form of the tradition, as exemplified (a) in the *Didaché* and (b) in the uninterpolated text of Luke, with the Pauline, which has served as material to the "Alexandrian" interpolators (Lk. 22:19b-20=I Cor. 11:24f.), it will be apparent that Mark also has worked on the basis of the same Petrine form. But the change effected is a more important one (from the doctrinal point of view) than that by which he appears to have adapted the story to the Roman ecclesiastical calendar and system of dating. Mark deals, like the rest, with the lesson *ministrare non ministrari*, though he transfers the occasion (we know not on what authority, but with gain in psychological probability) to the group of anecdotes formed by him on the theme Renunciation and Reward (Mk. 9:30-10:45). But the most vital change in Mark's account of the Supper is exactly in line with that of the "Alexandrian" interpolators of the text of Luke. He introduces the essential feature of Pauline teaching in the words: "This is my blood of the covenant (later texts have "the new covenant"), which is poured out for many." The precise relation of the two traditions will more clearly appear if we place them in parallel columns, transposing the Markan order. In order to cover the whole Lukan context,

the prefixed account of the Quarrel Who should be Greatest (Mk. 10:41-45) is included.

I

Lk. 22:14-30 β text

And when the hour was come he sat down and the Apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I shall not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks he said: Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took (leavened) bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave to them, saying, This is my body.

II

But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. For the Son of Man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined: but woe unto that man through whom he is

I

Mk. 14:22-26.

And as they were eating he took (leavened) bread, and when he had blessed he brake it, and gave to them and said, Take ye, this is my body.

And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

And when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the Mount of Olives.

II

Mk. 14:17-21.

And when it was evening he cometh with the Twelve. And as they sat and were eating, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you shall betray me, even he that eateth with me. They be-

betrayed! And they began to question among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing.

gan to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? And he said unto them, It is one of the Twelve, he that dippeth with me in the dish. For the Son of Man goeth, even as it is written of him: but woe unto that man through whom the Son of Man is betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had not been born.

III

III

Mk. 10:41-45.

And there arose also a contention among them, which of them was accounted to be greatest. And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For which is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat? But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth.

And when the ten heard it they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John. And Jesus called them to him and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you; but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For the Son of Man also came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

IV

But ye are they that have continued with me in my trials; and I covenant (διατίθεμαι) unto you a kingdom, even as my Father covenanted (διέθετο) unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

IV

Mk. 10:35-40.

And there come near unto him James and John, the sons of Zebedee, saying unto him, Teacher, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask of thee. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand and one on thy left hand, in thy glory. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto him, We are able. And Jesus said unto them, The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized; but to sit on my right hand or on my left hand is not mine to give; but it is for them for whom it hath been prepared.

The fundamental identity of these two records is self-evident, in spite of much transposition of order by Mark, including the supply of certain local and

temporal settings. On which side the dependence lies, and whether it be oral or literary in character, is less easy to determine; but this question can at least be deferred. It is more important for our present inquiry to notice the difference in character of the two conceptions of the observance.

The opening paragraph of Luke's story has features quite unknown to Mark, but whose omission by Mark could easily be accounted for, since they imply (in accordance with the Johannine dating, but contrary to the chronology of Mark) that the occasion is that of the Sanctification of Passover, not the Passover itself. Jesus, presiding at the Kiddush, tells of his earnest desire (the expression "to desire with desire" is a Semitism) to celebrate the coming Redemption feast with the Twelve. This desire, however, will be frustrated by betrayal. The hand of him who is to "deliver him up" (παραδιδόντος, to agree with Is. 53:12 LXX) is with him on the table. Therefore, his Redemption feast must be celebrated "when it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." The Sanctification in which they now engage must therefore also be for the messianic banquet in Paradise. Here the only words at all resembling the Pauline report are those uttered after breaking the (leavened) bread, "This is my body." From the ritual of the *Didaché* it is easy to see that the words were not always understood as implying self-dedication, but as

symbolizing the scattering and reunion of Jesus' following. It is the Church which here is "sanctified." It is the Church which is symbolized by the broken loaf whose scattered elements are reunited.

We are not specially concerned with the section relating to the betrayal, paralleled by Mk. 14:17-21, but merely point out that it follows in Luke with logical propriety, introduced by the conjunction "only" (πλήν); whereas in the arrangement of Mark the reader is obliged to suppose that after this appalling disclosure the Twelve quietly resumed eating (ver. 22). The priority would seem to be with Q. It is also noteworthy that in the series of enlargements which this incident of the Identification of the Betrayer undergoes from one Gospel to another the simplest form of all is Luke's, after which comes Mark's, then Matthew's, and finally John's.

We may also leave undetermined the question of priority in the case of the Quarrel for Precedence. A location so impossible psychologically as immediately after Jesus' announcement of his betrayal and death is difficult to credit to so skilful a narrator as Luke, and we have additional reason for ascribing this connection rather to his source than to Luke personally from the fact that Matthew, who preserves only the single logion concerning the twelve thrones (Mt. 19:28 = Lk. 22:30), attaches it to Mark's version of the Quarrel. The connection is obviously pragmatic

rather than historical. In primitive church circles, more need was felt of an explanation of how different from Gentile domination would be the "sitting on thrones" to which Christians look forward, than for a correct historical sequence. In this instance, however, it is not Mark who gives evidence of arrangement for didactic purposes (πρὸς τὰς χρείας), but the Lukan Source.

The paragraph of greatest importance to our inquiry is that which closes the extract, and clearly indicates in what sense the pre-Lukan evangelist understands this rite to be instituted as a "Covenant" Supper. Paul's contrast of the covenant of Moses with the new covenant "in the blood of Christ" seems never to have entered his mind at all. He is equally insensible to the antithesis which the author of Hebrews so eloquently develops (on the basis of II Cor. 3:3-6) between the covenant written on tables of stone, and that of which Jeremiah had promised that its requirement would be written in Israel's heart. Luke makes the institution of the Supper to be a "covenant" (διατίθεμαι) made by Jesus at his parting from the Twelve that they shall share with him in the messianic banquet of the New Jerusalem. It is the Father's omnipotent decree to give the kingdom to this little flock (Lk. 12:32). Jesus pledges them in the wine and bread that they shall eat (ἔσθειν) and drink at his table in his kingdom, as David pledged to the de-

scendants of Jonathan his beloved. And the scene which dominates is that depicted by the Psalmist, who sings the glories of the Jerusalem of messianic days:

Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem . . .
Whither the tribes go up as a testimony to Israel,
To give thanks unto the name of Jehovah.
For there are set *thrones for judgment,*
The thrones of the house of David.

Fortunately, there is little need to discuss the question of priority in the case of this logion, which, however reluctantly, even Harnack feels obliged to include with the other elements of Q. True, the type of Christology is unmistakably Jewish-Christian. This is a typical case of Son-of-David eschatology; but even the curious spelling of ἔσθειν, peculiar to the Q elements of Luke and extracts from it, shows the derivation.

And there is further proof of antiquity. In II Tim. 2:11-13 the writer cites among the "faithful sayings" current in the Church of his time a poetic fragment almost certainly belonging to one of the eucharistic hymns. Its theme is identical with that of the story before us. Those who have shared the trials of the Master shall share his glory. Denial on earth will involve denial before the heavenly judgment-seat. Yet even should the follower's faith fail like Peter's, Christ will witness his own good

confession, for what he essentially is he cannot but confess.

> Faithful is the saying:
> For if we died with him, we shall also live with him:
> If we endure, we shall also reign with him:
> If we shall deny him, he also will deny us:
> If we are faithless, he abideth faithful:
> For he cannot deny himself.

The Lukan story of the Covenant Supper ends with the same triumphant note:

> Ye are they that have endured with me in my trials, and I covenant unto you a kingdom, as my Father covenanted me: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

We have traced thus to a north-Syrian, and probably (in the geographical sense) to a Petrine origin, an interpretation of the farewell Supper which seems completely devoid of that element which Paul makes central. However the particular problems of literary or oral dependence and inter-relationship may finally be solved, the mass of evidence is too great to be ignored which indicates that even in Paul's own time, and certainly later, the Supper was observed at Antioch in a way hardly in line with Paul's demand for a discrimination of the Lord's body. For while here the doctrine of the Servant is still cherished in the lesson *ministrare non ministrari*, the symbolism of the ritual is quite unrelated to any doctrine of

vicarious atonement. What historical inference must, then, be drawn? Is Paul guilty of introducing the "theological doctrines of later Judaism"? Or is he in this case the more faithful witness of the two, recalling vital features of the tragedy which later generations of believers, less keen than Paul to apprehend the distinctive factor in the new faith, or more ready than he to yield to the charges and persuasions of the Synagogue, were permitting to fade out of view?

Provisionally we should answer that the latter is the case. It is the latest only of the Synoptic evangelists who has succeeded in completely eliminating from his story of the Supper the doctrine that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." Luke rests indeed on very early sources of Palestinian derivation. But they are open to doubt on questions affecting the doctrine of "grace." The case is not unique. No document that we know of stands so closely allied with Q, especially in the form it assumes in the Lukan Special Source, as the Epistle of James. When it becomes proper to judge Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith apart from works of Law on the standard determined by the Epistle of James, it may be proper to interpret the meaning of Jesus in the institution of the Supper by the account of Luke. Geographically, the source of this account may be designated Petrine, because its

provenance appears to be from a region where Peter's name was of supreme authority. But this is a deutero-Peter that speaks. We come nearer to the Apostle himself in the teaching of the great epistle written in Peter's name to the churches of Asia after Paul's death. Here the voice is indeed Paul's; but not Paul's alone. It is an echo of Peter's witness when we read here of the great "Shepherd and Bishop of souls:"

> who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes we were healed.

It is this Servant-doctrine which even the liturgy of the *Didaché* itself reflects in its phraseology.

Comparison of the accounts of the Covenant Supper shows, then, a divergence along characteristic lines from before the time of the Pauline Epistles. Paul naturally emphasizes the element of sacrifice. Not indeed after the manner of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose author pursues the Alexandrian method of typology to set in antithesis the sacrificial ritual and the one eternal sacrifice which now has forever superseded it, the "law of carnal commandments" and the inward law written on the tables of the heart. For while Paul exhibits the germs from which these themes are elaborated by his follower, the Apostle himself is singularly devoid of references to the Levitical system. Paul has indeed repeated references to the Isaian figure of the Servant whose

soul was "made an offering for sin" (literally "was made sin," cf. II Cor. 5:21). But apart from the figure thus adopted from the classic Isaian passage, he is completely destitute of allusion to, or interest in, the sacrificial system. The feasts, which belong to Synagogue worship, enter deeply into Paul's thought, but for the temple worship he has no concern. We have seen, however, how profoundly he is concerned for the doctrine of the vicarious suffering of Jesus. It is not too much to say that Paul would have had no gospel at all but for this "word of the cross," the Reconciliation (καταλλαγή) effected through the self-dedication of Jesus. Because forgiveness of sins on account of the suffering of the cross was preached, Paul became a persecutor. Because of a Justification (δικαιοσύνη) thus to be obtained when he despaired of any by merit of his own, he reversed the currents of his life and placed himself among the ranks of his persecuted victims. Because of this he contended for his apostleship as an embassage from God, as though God were entreating the world by it to be reconciled and forgiven. Because of this he went through fire and water, braving the powers of darkness in this world and the next, assured that nothing here or hereafter could separate him from the love of God which had been demonstrated in this sacrifice. Take away from the significance of the memorial Supper the self-offering of

Jesus and his promise of intercession in heaven, and the Epistles of Paul become unintelligible. The story of his life becomes a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Does then the witness of Petrine tradition in its later forms take away this sense? Must we minimize the word of the cross because of the tendency so plainly traceable in the *Didaché,* in the Petrine sources of Luke, in James and elsewhere, to revert toward a Jewish-Christian type of piety, where repentance and loyalty to the new commandment take the place of Pauline "faith" as the ground of justification? Must we conclude that Paul's emphasis was misplaced, that Jesus had not really in mind a self-dedication to his martyr fate that Jehovah might be again "propitious" to his people? Was the vision of Jesus limited to a New Jerusalem and "thrones of the house of David"?

The problem is not a mere question of words. Even the clauses on which Paul lays all stress, "given for you," "shed for your sakes," might be omitted from the record (as they are in fact omitted in the Lukan form), and still we should be obliged to interpret the institution of the Supper and its observance "from the Lord onward" in the light of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. It is for this reason that the evangelists (and we ourselves) count it vital to tell the story of self-devotion from its beginning. If we deem that

Jesus carried the unfinished work of the Baptist to the center of Israel's religious life in order to make ready a people prepared for the coming of Jehovah, if we believe that he braved the cross to bring about this Reconciliation, then, with or without the words of formal consecration of the elements, we must believe that Paul's interpretation is justified, at least as regards the national application. Jesus' longing to celebrate the Redemption feast of Israel in Jerusalem with the Twelve remained, if we interpret the evidence aright, a desire fulfilled only in the larger, symbolic sense. He celebrated only its Consecration. But the memorial Supper remains his everlasting witness. Take from it all that the most jealous guardian of individual responsibility can demand by way of discount from current doctrines of solidarity (*zechuth*), make every concession on the score of apostolic and Pauline enthusiasm which the soberest historical criticism can require, and still the rite remains what the last and greatest of the evangelists has represented it, a memorial of immortal love. Historically, this "love" was doubtless that which Jewish patriots and martyrs express in the words of the Shema. To the Ephesian evangelist, it is love for "his own," the nucleus of the Church, the new Israel of God. "John" makes the Supper the token of Jesus' "consecration" of himself for the sake of all whom the Father should give him from the world.

He expresses his doctrine of solidarity in the great Parable of the Vine. But of the Supper itself he has only this to say:

> Now before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own that were in the world, he loved them unto the end.

b. THE ANOINTED SERVANT

CHAPTER IX.

JESUS' DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT

PAUL is the greatest champion of the witness of the Spirit and the most exigent of all who demanded it as proof of membership in the Israel of God. His whole gospel would have fallen in ruin without his doctrine of Life in the Spirit as complementary to that of Justification by Faith. Yet he is strangely indifferent to the rite of baptism and its accompanying "gifts of the Spirit." As a token of new birth by moral participation in the death and rising again of Jesus, baptism had deep significance to Paul, and he treats it as the universal rite of initiation by which all Christians were known, as completely established as the "circumcision made with hands" which admitted to the fellowship of Abraham. As Israel had been "baptized unto Moses" in the Red Sea and the overshadowing cloud, so every Christian must pass beneath the waters of baptism and, emerging, be overshadowed by the Spirit ere he became one of the company who under leadership of the spiritual Messiah were taking their journey through an earthly wilderness toward a Promised Land. Yet Paul leaves

the administration of the rite to others, and, so far as the "gifts" are concerned, occupies himself invariably with depreciation of the outward and spectacular, to insist on the inward and moral as alone having permanent value. Nothing save what he calls "the mind (νοῦς) of Christ," or "minding the things of Christ" (φρονεῖν ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), justifies to his mind, the claim to have the Spirit (πνεῦμα) of Christ.

Paul is also the very source and fountainhead of the "higher" Christology, the first to identify the risen Lord with the eternal divine Spirit of redemptive Wisdom, God's agent in creation no less than in revelation through the spirits of the prophets. To him it was the very essence of the divine redemptive purpose that "the whole 'fulness' " of heavenly potencies should take up its abode in Jesus, though he fixes neither on birth nor baptism as marking the particular moment of this indwelling of the Spirit.

Considering how vital it was to Paul's gospel to prove that "the whole fulness" (of the Spirit) had taken up its abode in Jesus (Col. 1:19), it may well seem strange that he never refers to a single manifestation of divine powers or prophetic gifts in Jesus' earthly life. He mentions no healing, no exorcism, no miracle, no utterance of supernatural prevision or gnosis. Yet we get some inkling of the reason when we notice with what reluctance Paul is forced to appeal to outward "gifts of the Spirit" in his own

case. We know from Luke that exorcisms had taken place at Paul's word of power (Acts 16:16ff.). Luke delights in such evidences of apostolic authority (Acts 19:11-16), but Paul fixes all his attention on the "wrestling with powers of evil in the heavenly places." He sets the example for our fourth evangelist of ignoring the "casting out of demons." We know from Paul's own statement, reluctantly given, that he "spoke with tongues," used the word of healing as well as the word of punitive power, performed "miracles," in short "showed all the signs of an Apostle." He is even credited in the first-hand story of an eye-witness with the resuscitation of a corpse (νεκρός) (Acts 20:7-12). Yet appeal to such "signs" appears distasteful to Paul. In assemblies like those in Thessalonica he must have seemed almost to cast a chill over the exercises. True, he did not wish the "Spirit" to be entirely "quenched," but his moral tests must have been discouraging to many of the "prophets." At Corinth, where the manifestations were peculiarly exuberant, his directions for the securing of decency and order are most explicit. Everything must give way to the principle of "edification." Whatever has no moral value is to be rigidly suppressed. Unless the "gifts" spring from the qualities inherent in the mind of Christ, they are, at best, transitory phenomena. At worst, they may spring from evil and unchristian powers. The "spirits" are

to be "judged." If they are not Christ-like, they are not to be tolerated. To the Romans Paul makes his doctrine of "the Spirit" equally clear, though of course without specific instructions to a church not under his authority.

This attitude on Paul's part toward the thaumaturgic manifestations attendant on the gospel preaching of his time may be taken as an irrefutable proof of their historical reality. It is often appealed to by apologists in defense of traditional conceptions of miracle. The application is legitimate. The phenomena did occur. They did call forth such marvel on the part of eye-witnesses as appears in the descriptions of Paul's companion recorded in Acts. But the lesson Paul himself would have drawn is strikingly different. Paul set himself with all his might against the prevailing tendency to magnify this thaumaturgic interest. He sought to bring into the foreground what to him possessed alone abiding significance, the morally transforming power of the "mind of Christ." Realizing as we must from tendencies of our own time how strong the current of thaumaturgic interest was against which Paul set himself, we can scarcely wonder at the inferiority of Petrine tradition on this score, as revealed in that glimpse of current gospel narrative which is afforded us after Paul's death in Synoptic story.

Petrine tradition survives in twofold form, a west-

ern type represented in the Gospel of Mark, purporting to give the report of the preaching of Peter as gathered at Rome some time after the Apostle's death, and another form current apparently in Syria. In both, the compilers have collected anecdotes illustrative of Jesus' Galilean ministry with the obvious purpose of showing him as the Anointed Servant, making more or less definite allusion to the Isaian prophecy. The conception appears first in the sources of Acts. Jesus is called the Anointed Servant in the Church's thanksgiving after the release of Peter and John (Acts 4:25-27). They here apply the passage Ps. 2:1f. to "Thy holy Servant Jesus, whom Thou didst anoint." So again in Peter's speech before Cornelius (Acts 10:38):

> God "anointed" him with the Holy Spirit and with power: who went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.

As already noted, the story of the Galilean ministry in all forms known to us centers upon the demonstrations of the Spirit and of power which ensued upon the baptism of Jesus. The prefatory vision by which its spiritual significance is interpreted to the reader translates into dramatic form the Isaian description:

> Behold my Servant whom I have chosen;
> My Beloved, whom my soul elected;
> I will put my Spirit upon him
> And he shall proclaim true religion to the Gentiles.

It was logically unavoidable that the story of Calvary should carry with it the preliminary account of the Galilean ministry. How else should the convert know for what object the Martyr died, or the nature of that "Lord" to whose intercession he trusted for salvation in the great Day of Judgment? An account of the baptism of Jesus and of what he did thereafter would form the natural preface to the story of Calvary. It would be as indispensable to any narrative type of gospel teaching as Paul's doctrine of Life in the Spirit is indispensable to his doctrine of Justification by Faith. Hence the gospel story of the Anointed Servant. In its western form (Mark) it is more crudely thaumaturgic than in the eastern (Q). In both it is concerned to prove that Jesus manifested all the "gifts of the Spirit" in supreme degree, that "it was the divine decree that the whole 'fulness' should make its abode in him in bodily form." If the historical thread of reformatory activity continuing the work of the Baptist is largely overlaid (especially in Mark, which represents the western form) by tales of miracle and marvel, this is no more than we should be prepared for by experience with the story of Paul in Acts. In every case the object is to prove Jesus' supreme endowment with the Spirit. It is because of this that it is chiefly in the first part of Synoptic story that the faith-wonder appears. Miracle plays scarcely any part after

the ministry in Galilee. But in the earlier chapters one of the leading objects is to show Jesus' divine endowments. He teaches and heals "with authority." In Mark, our earliest extant Gospel, Jesus' anointing takes place at his baptism by John, and is immediately followed by the account of his activity in "doing good, healing all that were oppressed by the devil." But Mark's Christology is adoptionist. At least Mark's opening paragraphs admit an adoptionist or even docetic interpretation. Such a doctrine is avoided in Matthew and Luke by carrying back the indwelling of the Spirit to Jesus' birth and coupling it, somewhat illogically, to the genealogies compiled in support of a Son-of-David Christology. In the latest Gospel of all, there is a return. John presents an incarnation doctrine of Pauline type based explicitly on a Logos doctrine. From first to last the object in view is the proof of Jesus' divine "authority."

In tracing back these variant earlier and later forms, the historical inquirer must realize that the common object in all the Gospels, the starting-point from which all are derived, is the doctrine that in Jesus the Isaian prediction of the "anointing" of the Servant was fulfilled. God "put His Spirit upon him so that he went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed of the devil." In what various ways this common theme of Petrine gospel was developed and

interpreted we shall be better able to appreciate when we have compared the Markan form of the story with its parallel in Q.

Two elemental factors are clearly present in all forms of the Synoptic record of the Galilean ministry, and in each of these a comparison may be made between Mark and the Second Source. Their derivatives exhibit the same factors. In all forms we have (1) an account, modified according to special interest, of how Jesus was "anointed with the Holy Spirit, so that he went about doing good." This is more or less closely linked up with the prophecies of Isaiah concerning the endowment of the Servant with the Spirit (Is. 42:1ff.; 61:1f.; cf. Mt. 12:18ff.; Lk. 4:17-21), though in Mark this connection is greatly obscured by another interest of which we shall speak presently. (2) In the material surviving from the Second Source we have also a group which from its main content may be called the section on The Stumbling of Israel. It has the form of a discourse of Jesus uttered apropos of the coming of messengers from John the Baptist to ask, "Art thou the Coming One?" A second paragraph deals with the rejection of the Servant. After giving his reply to the Baptist, Jesus reproaches his hearers for having turned a deaf ear to both of God's heralds of repentance, John and himself. Thus the discourse on The Stumbling of Israel serves the intended purpose of a demonstra-

tion in reply to Jewish unbelief that Jesus is the Redeemer foretold by Isaiah. Over against the ministry of John, Jesus places his own, emphasizing first to the Baptist, thereafter a second time to the multitude, its correspondence with Isaian prophecy concerning the work of Jehovah's Spirit in freeing the captive and restoring the broken and wounded people of God.[1] The fact that he reproaches "the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done" proves that the substance of the discourse belongs late in the Galilean ministry, perhaps at its close, at all events at a time when rejection on the part of these cities could be spoken of as an accomplished fact. Only isolated extracts or allusions betray Mark's acquaintance with the greater part of this Q material.

It is with some difficulty that one can identify the general outline of that section of Mark which relates The Growth of Opposition (Mk. 1:40-3:6) as in reality the same as that of The Stumbling of Israel in Q. Mark retains a bare outline of mighty works appealed to by Jesus as proofs of his authority as "Son of Man" (cf. Q "the lepers are cleansed," "the lame walk"; note also the phrases "the 'Son of Man' came eating and drinking," "a friend of publicans and sinners," "the disciples of John," "sons of the bride-chamber cannot fast"). He deals saliently with

[1] With this application of the Isaian prophecy of restoration should be compared that of Blessing II of the *Shemoneh Esreh.* See below p. 312.

the objection "Who is this that even forgiveth sins?" (Mk. 2:5-10; cf. Lk. 7:36-50); and closes with a conspiracy of the Pharisees with the Herodians against Jesus' life. Without these coincidences it would hardly be apparent that Mark is really constructing a parallel to the Q section. His order is here topical rather than chronological, as appears from the closing paragraph. But what has become of the Q motive, the presence of the redemptive "Spirit of God" as the real agent? The doctrine of Jesus as the Isaian Servant seems to be basic here, as in Q and the Petrine speeches of Acts. What new interest has supervened to the obscuration of the original lesson?

In spite of his reference (partly erroneous) to "Isaiah the prophet" (Mk. 1:2), Mark's account of the Baptism and Temptation allows one to discern at best but very dimly that the underlying motive is that of fulfilment of the promise (Is. 41:1f.):

Behold my Servant whom I have chosen,
My Beloved, on whom my soul fixed her choice,
I will put my Spirit upon him,
He shall proclaim judgment (true religion) to the Gentiles.

Here a parallel obscuration is observable. One must go to the Q material of Matthew and Luke to discover why the Spirit descends "in the likeness of a dove." Only from Q can one learn the significance of the temptations, which show in what sense the title "Son of God" is to be taken. Mark is so preoccupied

with his demonstration that John was the expected Elijah, and that he had in reality "anointed the Christ and made him known," thus meeting current Jewish expectation (Justin Martyr, *Dial.* viii. xlix.), that little remains of the original fulfilment of Isaian prophecy. Mark tells us indeed that Jesus was "baptized of the Spirit" at the hands of the Baptist-Elias, and that John predicted on this occasion the Pentecostal gifts (Mk. 1:8); but it is only by turning to Lk. 4:2-21 that one perceives that the purpose of the whole narration was to show that Jesus was no other than that Servant, beloved and chosen, whom God endowed with His own Spirit for the work of redemption.

If we now return to the section where appeal is made to "the works of Christ," the contrast between Mark and Q will be found still more striking. In the group of anecdotes which begins in Mk. 1:40 with the Cleansing of the Leper, and ends in 3:6 with the plot against Jesus' life, Mark is intent on proving the authority of Jesus as Son of Man. On this ground Jesus forgives sins, associates with the publicans and sinners, and disregards fasts and sabbaths. As proof of his authority he makes the lame to walk by a word, justifies his mission to sinners, and applies to his disciples the exemption of wedding guests from fasting. As Son of Man he even sets aside the Sabbath. This results in the conspiracy against him.

In the corresponding section of Q, appeal is also made to the miracles of healing, but in a very different manner from Mark's, and with a different object. Lepers are cleansed and the lame walk. But Jesus does not appeal to these phenomena as proofs of his personal authority. He cites them as tokens of the gracious presence of *the divine Spirit* restoring broken and captive Israel. John should take note of the gracious work of God, and not be stumbled in the person of God's agent, who may, or may not be "he that should come."

Other mighty works are brought under discussion by Q in the same connection. Isaiah and other prophets had compared the restoration of Israel to a raising of the nation from the dead, a release of captives, a proclamation of glad tidings of forgiveness to a people in poverty and wretchedness. The fulfilment of this prophecy is shown in a further description of "the works of the Christ," while Israel's unbelief is rebuked. After the sending away of John's messengers Jesus proceeds to defend the genial life led by himself and his disciples in association with "publicans and sinners," using the figure of the wedding guests (cf. Mk. 2:15-17, 18-20). In the fuller (Lukan) form of the story he defends in particular his right to declare to "a woman that was a sinner" "Thy sins are forgiven." He does not meet the murmurs of scribes and Pharisees, however, as in Mark,

by exhibiting his miraculous power, but points to the woman's conduct as evidence of the present operation of God (Lk. 7:36-50). Matthew interjects at this point (12:1-17) the two sabbatarian conflicts of Mark with their resultant plot against Jesus. We may pass over the intercalation. The same evangelist continues with the objection of the scribes to Jesus' exorcisms (slightly displaced in Mk. 3:22-30): "He casteth out by Beelzebub" (Mt. 12:22-30). Jesus' reply is that the exorcisms are not his own. They, too, are the work of "the Spirit of God." They represent the predicted "opening of the prison-house." They prove that the captivity of Israel is nearing its end, as Isaiah had said:

> Shall the prey be taken from the mighty?
> Or the lawful captives be delivered?
> But thus saith Jehovah,
> Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away
> And the prey of the terrible shall be delivered;
> For I will contend with him that contendeth with thee
> And I will save thy children.[2]

In Q the point is made perfectly plain in Jesus' parable of the Strong Man Armed. He means that the Mightier than the Strong Man, who sweeps away his captives, is God himself working by his "Spirit" (Lk., his "finger"). The correct application of this parable to the victory of God in Christ releasing those "whom Satan had bound" is universal among primi-

[2] Is. 49:24f.

tive Christian writers. In Mark the essence of the whole story is omitted and the original application so obscured that Jesus appears to be rebuking the scribes for calumnies spoken against himself. Jesus *himself* now appears as the Stronger than Satan. But one must read the entire Q context from Mt. 11:2 to 12:45, omitting the section interjected from Mark in 12:1-17, and adding (as a section omitted from Q because of Matthew's dislike of material of this kind) Lk. 7:36-50, in order to appreciate the difference in point of view between the Roman evangelist and the primitive Source.

Briefly the difference is as follows: Mark is concerned to prove the personal authority of Jesus as "a son of God" (15:39). As such he can forgive sins, set aside Jewish fasts and sabbaths, and institute a new moral order. According to Mark, Jesus proves this by demonstrations of miraculous power, which, however, only spur the Jewish leaders to murderous hostility. The Source, on the other hand (Q), is concerned to prove the *mission* of Jesus to be from God. Q appeals to the *character* of his message and mode of life, which are appropriately described in the quotation from Is. 42:1-4 inserted by Matthew after his extract from Mark in 12:1-16, but certainly otherwise placed in the Source. The quality and kind of Jesus' ministry, together with the operations of "the Spirit," prove him to be the awaited Servant of Je-

hovah. Works of divine mercy and healing follow with his proclamation of the acceptable year of the Lord, and prove that God has indeed "visited his people." Fulfilment of the Isaian promise of forgiveness, healing, restoration from bondage to freedom and to new (national) life, may be seen in the operations of the Spirit of God; for these accompany Jesus' message of peace and comfort to all that are weary and heavy laden. Those whom Satan had bound are released by a "Mightier than the Giant" that will soon end his evil dominion. There are healings of the leprous and the lame. The blind receive their sight and the deaf hear. Only spiritual blindness resists. But this is impervious. An evil and adulterous generation demands "a sign," when even Nineveh repented at the bare word of Jonah, and the Queen of the South came from the ends of the earth at the mere report of the wisdom of Solomon. The last state of these spiritually dead will be worse than that under which they are now groaning. God's Spirit is at work in their very midst, and they gaze at the clouds and cry: "Lo, here! Lo, there!"

Mark preaches the miraculous power of Jesus. Q preaches the love and power of God *in* Christ. Mark proclaims the wonders of the man who was endowed with the Spirit of Adoption in its plenitude, so that even legions of devils were subject to him. The Source reports Jesus' proclamation of peace from

God to the penitent, and how it was confirmed to them that heard by manifold tokens of the present working of the divine Spirit of redemption. Mark reports how the scribes and Pharisees blasphemed the Christ and plotted against his life. The Source reports how they remained spiritually blind and deaf to the work of God, blaspheming not him, but "the Spirit of God" which through his agency was turning sinners to repentance and overthrowing the kingdom of Satan. The difference is subtle, but deep. Fortunately we have the testimony of Paul to prove that it is the Q material rather than Mark which stands closer to historic fact. Jesus repelled and protested against the fame of the exorciser and thaumaturgist. He did not seek his own glory, but that of his Father in heaven.

It is not without significance for our conception of the doctrine of the Spirit exhibited in Paul and James as really derived from Jesus himself, to observe in what connection the primitive evangelist presents it. Wherever the "disciples of John" appear in contact with the representatives of Christianity the sources make baptism the issue. The baptism of John and Christian baptism; if not equivalent how do they differ? And always the answer is: John's baptism is good as far as it goes—repentance; but Christian baptism means conscious endowment with "the Spirit." He that is least in the Kingdom is greater than John

because conscious of its present activity. John's disciples are looking for a great Day of Jehovah to come. Jesus' disciples rejoice like sons of the bride-chamber in a kingdom whose activity is already apparent. It is among them and in them. This is that doctrine of a redeeming present Spirit of God, which made Jesus' message glad tidings to the poor.

It will be apparent from the foregoing that if we accept at all the testimony of the Second Source (and for at least the teaching of Jesus there is none better), it must be admitted that he taught a very positive and definite doctrine of the Spirit, so that the keen observation of Royce regarding the essential nature of Christianity finds justification on the historical side. From the very start it was "a religion of the Spirit." The doctrine of Jesus was not, of course, of precisely the same type we encounter later in the teaching of the Apostles. Its closest affinities are with the Old Testament. Jesus' hope for the return of his people to their proper relation to Jehovah is based, like Ezekiel's, on the inbreathing of a new spirit from God (Ez. 11:19; 18:31; 36:26f.). It is to be accomplished "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of hosts" (Zech. 4:6). He fully accepted the Baptist's word predicting the intervention of God, "when the harvest is come," in whirlwind, earthquake, and fire; but his own mission was for a period of seed-time still remaining. The divine

coöperation of which he saw gracious tokens on every side was that of the still small voice. But Mark's conception scarcely does justice to the inward, ethical side of this teaching of the works of the Spirit.

A similar judgment must be passed on Mark's use of the Parables of the Kingdom when compared with their intrinsic sense. It is Jesus' reliance on the invisible, present working of the Spirit of Jehovah, silent as the growth of plants and trees, imperceptible as the working of leaven in the dough, yet irresistible as sure, which gives to his teaching as to the coming Kingdom of God its extraordinary contrast to current apocalyptic views. The Parables of the Mustard-Seed, The Leaven, The Patient Husbandman, The Sower, should be placed alongside the imagery of Daniel and *Enoch*, if one would do real justice to this difference. Mark's eschatology is of the ordinary apocalyptic type. He cites the parables for an alien purpose. It is this reliance on the present sovereignty of Jehovah which gives meaning to Jesus' rebuke of the casters of horoscopes, the seekers of portents, the cries of "Lo, here; lo, there." Against the externalization of current apocalyptic eschatology Jesus declares: "The kingdom of God is within you" (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν) or, if the alternate rendering be preferred, "in your midst."

It is the same faith of Jesus in the invisible, present working of God which gives point to his rebuke

of the scribes who attribute the release of Satan's captives to Jesus' collusion with Beelzebub, instead of recognizing the Spirit (Lk. "the finger") of God. He replies that they have been "overtaken by the kingdom unaware" (προέφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς). Jesus has eyes and ears that are spiritually open. He lives in continual contact with a "living" God. He cannot understand teachers of Israel who can predict the weather, but cannot read the "signs of the times," whose inward eyes are darkened by prejudice, who "do not even repent themselves afterwards" when they behold publicans and sinners entering the kingdom before themselves. To him, this is the expected time of the Great Repentance. John was the promised Elijah who should bring it to pass. The penitent faith of a harlot bedewing his feet with her tears, then hastily wiping away their defiling touch with her hair, was to him the proof that God was sanctioning his message of forgiveness. The "much love" was the work of God's Spirit in her heart. His host, the Pharisee, takes an opposite view. To Simon the contact was proof that "this man is *not* a prophet." Mark, as we know, is also eager to prove that Jesus as Son of Man has authority, even on earth, to forgive sins. But Mark's method of proof from divine power is not that of Petrine tradition in its eastern form (Q).

Not alone is the word of Jesus, in explicit distinction from that of John, a gospel of forgiveness, rec-

onciliation and peace, comfort, healing, release, glad tidings to the poor, life to a nation spiritually dead, his whole mission is conceived in terms of the great prophecy of the consolation of Israel.

We have seen that "the beginning of the gospel" as Mark relates it corresponds with the summary in Peter's words to Cornelius. God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power, so that he went about doing good, healing all that were under the tyranny (καταδυναστευομένους) of the devil, for God was with him." The "anointing" is related in terms unmistakably based on the prophecy of Isaiah:

> Behold my Servant whom I have chosen
> My Beloved, on whom my soul fixed her choice.
> I will put my Spirit upon him,
> And he shall bring forth true religion to the Gentiles.

Luke has recast the story of the "beginning" to adapt it to his special theme of how "this salvation of God was sent unto the Gentiles," but Luke retains the original values. He has merely substituted another equivalent passage of the same prophet of the Consolation for that which Jesus employs in the Q discourse to prove that his work is the fulfilment of the Isaian prediction. In the Lukan "programmatic discourse" (Lk. 4:16ff.) Jesus, returning from the scene of baptism and temptation, declares at Nazareth to his unbelieving fellow-countrymen that they are witnesses "to-day" of the fulfilment of the scripture:

The Spirit of Jehovah is upon me,
Because he *anointed* me to preach glad tidings to the poor.
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of Jehovah.

This is probably less original than the quotation in the Q discourse; but it would require some hardihood to maintain that Luke has violated its spirit or done injustice to the primitive Christian conviction that Jesus looked upon his entire mission as a ministry of "the Spirit of Jehovah," and found assurance of its validity and permanence in the evidences both moral and physical which attended it that "God was with him."

Synoptic tradition in all forms thus takes its start from the "anointing" of the Servant with the Spirit. The principal difference between Pauline and Petrine tradition on this score is that in Paul utmost emphasis is laid on the *moral* workings of "the Spirit," with deprecation of the tendency to appeal to the thaumaturgic; whereas in the Petrine tradition, both in its Markan and its Lukan form, this emphasis is reversed. The demand for "signs and wonders," which Paul treats as a weakness of "the Jews," is yielded to with very little restraint. In Mark especially, Jesus becomes a great thaumaturgist.

As respects Jesus' doctrine of the Spirit, the testimony of Paul, of Q, and of the Epistle of James

must be set over against that of Petrine tradition in its Markan form. Some would add the weight of the Fourth evangelist, but the evidence of independent historical tradition, as distinguished from simple religious appreciation, is too slight in this case to justify any claim on support from "John." When three witnesses so completely independent as James, Paul, and Q support the idea that moral transformation as evinced in nobler conduct may be ascribed to the regenerative influence of the Spirit of God, and teach this on the authority of Jesus, while, to offset this, we have only the well-known tendency of the superstitious in all ages to support the authority of religious teachers by claims of thaumaturgy, it should not be difficult to answer the question whether Paul in his moral evaluation of the "gifts of the Spirit" is merely giving play to his personal religious genius, or proving again his better apprehension of the true spirit and intention of Jesus. A reasonable historical judgment would seem to suggest that Paul is in reality indebted, as he never fails to represent, to the teaching of the great Master, when he makes "love" the one decisive test of the presence or absence of "the Spirit."

In one respect, however, the testimony of Q and James, if not Paul's also, would carry us further than the writer would consider it safe to go. In this literature we have an incipient doctrine of Incarna-

tion. In its character and nature that Spirit of God which accompanies Jesus in his work and is incarnate in his person is here the divine spirit of Wisdom, as depicted in the literature of the Jewish sages. To Paul as well as to the Second Source "meekness and gentleness" are the distinguishing characteristics of Jesus, unknown as these traits are to the portrait drawn by Mark. In James they are the outstanding traits in that inward "law" which controls the conduct of the Christian. In Q they are completely distinctive of Jesus. This appears most clearly in a lyric so manifestly constructed on the model of Wisdom utterances and so completely saturated with the ideas and phraseology of the sages that we cannot but regard it as a Hymn of Wisdom. The poem Mt. 11:25-30= Lk. 10:21f. has been placed in Jesus' mouth by the Source as the best expression of the evangelist's Christology. Exultant in the Holy Spirit, says Luke (as he had previously said of Zacharias, Mary, and others who break forth into inspired song), Jesus uttered the hymn:

I praise thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,
That thou didst hide these things (?) from the wise and prudent,
And didst reveal them unto babes;
Yes, Father, for such was the decree thou enactedst.

All revelation has been delivered to me by my Father;
And no man acknowledgeth the Son save the Father.
Neither doth any recognize the Father save the Son.
And he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.

The hymn is a thanksgiving of Israel, chosen to be Jehovah's "son," an election to know Him and be known of Him. The "hidden things" are probably the things prepared for the Beloved, as in the hymn quoted in I Cor. 2:9, though the original context is missing. The mission to make Jehovah known to the world is committed to the hands of his Servant-Son. He is the true "gnostic." To him the saving knowledge of God will be owing by all who attain it.

The adaptation which places this hymn in the mouth of Jesus makes apparent in what sense the evangelist takes the title "the Son," and how he regards Jesus as fulfilling the Isaian ideal of the anointed Servant. This becomes doubly clear when the closing strophe is added from Matthew. Luke omits it because this verse would be inappropriate to the setting he has given to the lyric:

Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and
I will give you rest.
Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and
lowly in heart.
And ye shall find rest for your souls.
For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

Other lyric sections of Q are explicitly referred to "the Wisdom of God," though placed in the mouth of Jesus. Thus the Plaint of Rejected Wisdom in Mt. 23:34ff.=Lk. 11:49f.; 13:34ff. reduces to poetic form the utterance of Jer. 7:25 and II Chron. 36:15ff., leading over to the similar quotation from

Prov. 1:23-33 which Clement of Rome (lvii.3ff.) makes from "Wisdom, fount of all the virtues." The speaker claims to have sent the messengers of God, "prophets and sages and scribes" (!), and to have ever brooded over Jerusalem with the solicitude of a mother-bird for its young. She is now driven from her "house," no more to return till her messengers are received with hosannahs of welcome. In the original intention this speaker is feminine. It can only be Jehovah's Spirit of redeeming Wisdom, who invariably takes this part in the Wisdom plaints of the later Jewish and Hellenistic literature. In Mt. 23:34ff.=Lk. 11:49ff.; 13-34ff. the following three stanzas are quoted from "the Wisdom of God:"

Behold I send unto you prophets and sages and scribes;
Some ye will kill and crucify,
Some ye will scourge in your synagogues,
And harry from city to city.

That all the blood shed on the earth may come upon you;
From the blood of Abel the righteous,
To the blood of Zacharias whom ye slew betwixt temple and altar.
Yea, I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets,
And stonest them that are sent unto thee,
How oft have I sought to gather thy children,
As a mother-bird gathereth her nestlings 'neath her wings?

And ye would not.
Lo, your house is left you forsaken.

For I say, Ye shall no more behold me,
Till ye cry: Blessed is the messenger that cometh in Jehovah's name.

A source which places the utterances of "the Wisdom of God" in the mouth of Jesus, which makes him the instrument of Jehovah's revelation to Israel and the world, which makes his works the works of "Wisdom," which makes the "babes" who accept his message "Wisdom's children," and which justifies her patience through them, can have conceived the mission and personality of Christ under no other terms than those of the "sages," who in the lyric come next after the "prophets" in the enumeration of God's messengers. Jesus is the incarnation of "Wisdom, fount of all virtues" (πανάρετος Σοφία). The Spirit of God which rests upon him at his baptism in the characteristic form of the tenderly brooding dove, whose cooing note is to the Jewish mind typical of Jehovah's love for his wayward people, the divine effluence which withdraws from his house, the temple, ere it can be given over to desolation, is the Spirit of Wisdom, thus characterized in Prov. 1:20ff.; 8:1-9:6. Such is indeed the meaning of the Prologue of John, if we translate the Hellenistic term Logos by its real Jewish equivalent.

However, it does not follow from this that Jesus himself taught a doctrine of incarnation, or even that his doctrine of redemption by the Spirit had the char-

acteristics of Alexandrian and Rabbinic Judaism. "James" teaches a doctrine of salvation of the purest "Wisdom" type. The writer of the Second Source conceives his subject primarily from the Petrine point of view. Jesus is the Isaian Servant. But as in Wisdom of Solomon, the Servant incarnates the "Wisdom" of God. We have here the basis of the Pauline Incarnation doctrine. But if we ask, what basis had all this in the actual teaching of Jesus? we are not warranted in going farther than the simple fact that Jesus did have a doctrine of the Spirit of God. He did point to this as a present agency of blessing and grace, overcoming the powers of Satan. This is the Gospel *of* Jesus. The inference from it as to his personal authority belongs to the gospel *about* Jesus, which attempts to interpret his person and work in terms of the redemptive purpose of God.

It is hard for our evangelists, writing from a later age in a Christian environment, to realize that Jesus was not a Christian preaching Christianity to hostile Jews. If our Synoptic evangelists make little attempt to exercise a historical imagination, the fourth, using the method of didactic dialogue to expound the distinctive doctrines of Christianity in his own age, is almost disdainful of any such limitation. His dialogue with Nicodemus aims to show how Christianity has two fundamental tenets which are utterly unknown to the "teachers of Israel." These tenets are (1)

Regeneration by the Spirit, typified in the rite of baptism, (2) Justification by Faith in the divine Sacrifice, typified in the memorial of the cross (Jn. 3:1-11, 12-21). The historical critic, retracing the steps of the theologian, must be on his guard against mistaking religious application for historical record. The testimony of the New Testament writers is unanimous and emphatic, including that of the fourth evangelist himself, that the gift of the Spirit, in the Christian sense, was a post-resurrection development. It came as a divine confirmation of the new faith, a "seal" set by God himself upon its confession. For the manifestation seemed indeed no other than the Spirit of God, to which all the prophets had looked forward as a gracious "outpouring" of "the last times," yet it came through Jesus. It was his gift "from above" to his still loyal followers, a token of his victory over the powers of death and hell. He had, therefore, "received from the Father" what he now "poured forth" in the sight and hearing of the world. To the apprehension of the primitive Church, the Spirit proceeded from the Father *and the Son*, and the Church has not failed to emphasize the fact in its official confessions. The adoptionism of Mark and the incarnation doctrine of Paul and John thus appear to have a common root. It is Jesus' reference of the gracious effects of his ministry to "the Spirit of God."

The line of demarcation should not be obscured.

In the days of his flesh, Jesus certainly did not teach the Christian doctrine of the Spirit nor institute the rite of baptism. We can but endorse the comment of Aphrahat (*Hom.* xii. 6) on the statement of Jn. 3:22ff.; 4:1-3 regarding a simultaneous work of baptism carried on by Jesus and his disciples side by side with John's. According to Aphrahat,

> During all the time that Jesus went about with his disciples they were baptized with the baptism of the priestly law, with the baptism at which John said: Repent of your sins.

But because there came to be a distinctively Christian doctrine of the Spirit, memorialized in the rite of baptism, we have no need to deny that there was previously a Jewish doctrine very close to it in character, in which the Christian doctrine is rooted. Neither should we disregard the well-attested promise: "John baptized in water, but ye shall be immersed in Spirit." Indeed, until this Jewish doctrine of "the Spirit" is fully understood and appreciated, we cannot do justice to the Christian. For the very point of what we are now attempting to show is that the Christian doctrine was not solely an outgrowth of the Pentecostal experiences of the Church, but found justification and meaning in the remembered teaching and life of Jesus.

Petrine tradition as recorded by Luke (Acts 1:5; 11:16) declares that Jesus explicitly contrasted the

baptism of John with a baptism of "the Spirit" wherewith his own followers must be imbued. It is true that Roman tradition as represented in Mk. 1-8 places the contrast in the mouth of the Baptist himself, thus setting the example for the fourth evangelist's portrait of a self-depreciatory Baptist. But a moment's comparison of the Q parallel will show the inferiority of Mark's version. Unless we reject the tradition altogether, we must admit it in its Lukan form (of course preferring Acts 11:16 to the adaptation Acts 1:5), admitting that Jesus did recognize that just this element of "grace," the coöperation of a spirit of obedience from Jehovah, was needful before John's message of warning to flee from the coming wrath could have its desired effect. We have already seen two reasons in the Q tradition for holding that Jesus did make exactly this distinction between his own work and the Baptism of John. When he speaks of his own message in parallelism with John's it is presented always as glad tidings of forgiveness, healing, comfort, gentle entreaty, over against the denunciations of doom upon the guilty uttered by his great forerunner. Again, when he answers the Judean prophet by pointing to his works of healing, and bids John not be stumbled in the agent, when he repels the slander of the scribes by pointing to "the Spirit of God" as the real liberator of the bond-slaves of Satan, when he hushes the murmur of the Pharisee at his

declaration of forgiveness to "a woman that was a sinner" by pointing to the evidences of her "much love," we have endeavored to show that the point of view is ever the same. Jesus holds that "the Spirit of God" is manifest in all these effects attendant on his ministry, more especially and explicitly in the penitence and faith of the "publicans and sinners." This, to his mind, is something which should have moved even the self-righteous Pharisees to repentance.

But is this truly authentic? Will it stand the test which we apply in the case of other Christian records? Can it be called truly consonant with contemporary Jewish teaching, so as to escape the charge of anachronistic coloration from later Christian ideas? The answer to questions such as these must come from genuinely prechristian Jewish documents. Nor will it suffice to point to the many passages of contemporary Jewish literature which dwell upon the prophets' predictions of the outpouring of the spirit of prophecy in the last days, nor those of the Wisdom literature which parallel this by predictions of the opening of the wells of wisdom [3] that all may have the knowledge of Jehovah; for the case is more specific. Jesus is speaking of the necessary coöperation of the Spirit of Jehovah *to accomplish the great repentance.* His expectation of the advent of the Kingdom as a dawn of healing, deliverance, and peace is based upon

[3] So the Wisdom fragment in *Enoch* xlviii. 1.

an invisible *moral* transformation effected by this agency. It is a parallel to this of which we are in search.

We have already adduced (p. 159) the scene from *Jubilees* 1:19ff. where God promises in answer to the intercession of Moses for guilty Israel a Great Repentance without backsliding. Moses admits their evil propensity (*yetser ha-ra*) and their moral inability, so long as "The Spirit of Belchor" (Belial?) has dominion over them. Therefore he prays:

> Create in them a clean heart and a holy spirit, and from now unto eternity let them no more be entangled in their sin.

This intercession of Moses and its answer promising the spirit of obedience reflects the devoutest aspiration of prechristian Pharisaism. But we have other evidence more clearly connected with Jesus himself, to show in what sense he understood the promise of redemption.

The heart of a people's religious life is disclosed in its forms of common prayer. Contemporary Jewish faith looked for the fulfilment of the Isaian Consolation of Israel by some manifestation of the Great Power of God. We still have the Synagogue "Blessing" (second of the *Shemoneh Esreh*, or "Eighteen") appealed to by Jesus on another occasion (Mk. 12:24-27), and this supplies the key to his answer to John's question, "Art thou he that should come?" Israel's

prayer for redemption to her "Mighty Champion" (Gibbor) is given on a later page (p. 393).

Blessings I-VIII, XIV and XV are entreaties for the coming of the promised Redeemer (*goel*), patterns not of the thought alone but of the very language of the New Testament and of the early Church. God is besought as the Giver of Wisdom (Bl. IV; cf. Jas. 1:5), Repentance (Bl. V), Forgiveness (Bl. VI), Redemption (Bl. VII) and Healing (Bl. VIII). He who "heals the diseases of Israel" will "sound the great trumpet to proclaim their emancipation, set up a standard to collect their captives, and gather them together from the four corners of the earth" (Cf. Is. 27:13; 49:22; I Thess. 4:16; I Cor. 15:52; *Didaché* X. 5). God, who will "speedily cause to flourish the offspring of David his servant," exalting this "horn of his salvation," is Israel's Redeemer (Bl. XV).

Jesus too believed that it was not enough that the people should be baptized with the baptism at which John had said: Repent, for after me cometh the executioner of judgment with winnowing fan and fire unquenchable. He, too, believed that the Father must create in them a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within them. In addition he believed that God was already pouring forth this holy spirit, and he ascribed to it the manifestations of physical and moral renewal which attended his "glad tidings to the poor." It was when his work had been completed on the cross that

his followers awoke to the full significance of what they had seen and heard. When they made baptism the rite of initiation into their brotherhood it was not the mere baptism which John preached, but baptism into the Spirit of God and Christ.

CHAPTER X.

THE PRIMITIVE MEANING OF THE SACRAMENTS

OUR brief inspection of the canonical archives of the Church will have had at least this effect: We shall realize better than before the vital significance of that obscure, non-literary period which precedes all our surviving documents; a period more truly formative of the faith than any other, but one wherein the message received expression only in oral form, and (after the oriental manner) was embodied in ritual. The earliest of our documents must be dated full twenty years after Calvary. It is Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians, redolent of a comparatively crude apocalyptic eschatology, a Son-of-Man Christology of the prevalent missionary type. The latest New Testament writing dates from about one hundred years after Paul's Epistle, and champions an eschatology not greatly different from the Thessalonian. But in the meantime almost every type of teaching had been advanced, and the twenty years of silence after Calvary were of greater importance for the development of Christian teaching than the hundred years of missionary activity which followed.

In the Pauline Epistles themselves, no less than in the Gospels, which in their present form must be placed almost a generation later, we find abundant evidence that the Apostolic Message had assumed fairly well defined forms in the preaching of those who were seeking to evangelize the world. It had, as it were, crystallized around two nuclei, baptism and the supper of the Lord.

No truly Christian teaching could wholly neglect either one of these basic institutions of the Church. But it was inevitable that there should be differences of emphasis. From the very nature of his entrance into the circle of apostolic preachers of the glad tidings, it could easily be foreseen that Paul would necessarily lay all stress upon his direct and personal experience of the crucified and risen Redeemer. Like every evangelist, Paul told the story of his own conversion; but he was also a preacher of the common faith. The word of the cross was his supreme appeal; but it could not stand alone. Paul's doctrine of Justification led to antinomian laxity when unsupported by his doctrine of Sanctification, or Life in the Spirit. On the other hand, Peter was far better qualified than Paul to bear witness to the nature and character of the "mind of Christ," and to tell of the manifestations of that Spirit wherewith Jesus had been endowed. We have every reason to accept the very early testimony which gives to Peter's preaching the distinctive

character of narration of "the sayings and doings of the Lord." This was not all. Peter preached *also* a doctrine of forgiveness of sins through the suffering of the cross. We have Paul's explicit testimony to this when he withstands his predecessor to the face, protesting that Peter has proved disloyal to the word of the cross in yielding to the influence of James.

Still there must have been some force in the opposition to Paul's apostolic claims which placed them in comparison with Peter's, declaring: "If you had been an apostle of (the Christ) for a single hour, you would proclaim his utterances and interpret his sayings" (*Clem. Hom.* XVII. 19). When we compare the Synoptic record (representative in both its main branches of the preaching of Peter) with the Pauline Epistles, it will be apparent that there must have been a decided difference in emphasis between the two main streams of apostolic preaching. Moreover, from the moment that Peter, followed by Barnabas and the majority of the church in Antioch, took sides with James and against Paul, this difference would tend to increase. After Paul's death this would be still more the case. For Paulinism was not understood. Paul's doctrine of "justification apart from works of law" was hard to defend. His own churches fell back upon "the tradition handed down from the very first" in practical self-defense against the corrupting tide of antinomian laxity. The Church as a

whole now entered upon a phase of neo-legalism. Emphasis certainly shifted in the period of consolidation and inner development from the gospel of "grace" proclaimed in apostolic missions toward a teaching of baptisms, relating to "the commandments of the Lord" and the "mighty works" whereby his authority was proved.

On this broad basis of distinction the principal types of gospel teaching represented in the New Testament can be understood. At the earliest accessible period stand the Pauline Epistles with a clear and positive affirmation of the doctrine of grace through the vicarious suffering of the Servant. This is explicitly stated to have been the original and common gospel, the "word of the cross." Later we meet with diverse strands of Petrine tradition, wherein at first something is traceable of the primitive Servant doctrine presupposed by Paul, but later, in the Lukan form, nothing remains of the teaching that "Christ died for our sins." Everything now centers on repentance, baptism, and the gift of the Spirit. Still more is this the case with James, where the doctrine of justification by faith apart from works is explicitly denied, and no mention at all is made of the suffering of Jesus. On the other hand, where the influence of Paul was still dominant, as in the Gospel and Epistles of John, we naturally find the propitiation theme. It also appears where

the martyr motif is strong, as in Revelation, Hebrews, and the Gospel of Mark.

If, then, we look back once more to the twenty years of growth in obscurity, devoid of literary forms, in which the Church had no written Gospels, no visible embodiment of its message save its two sacraments of baptism and the cup, we may find it well worth while to determine, more closely than has been possible hitherto, precisely what meaning each sacrament was intended to convey. Ultimately we may ask the question: What Christianity Means to Me. But that is not the question now. What we are asking now is what Christianity meant to the men who expressed their religious conviction in these rites.

Baptism was adopted, as we have seen, almost immediately after Calvary, as a rite of initiation. One was admitted by it to the brotherhood of believers in Jesus as risen "Lord." For this reason baptism was "into the name of Jesus" and was accompanied by a confession of loyalty. Christian neophytes took upon them, when in baptism they confessed "one Lord" and "one faith," a "unity of the Spirit," as Jewish neophytes in proselyte baptism "took upon them the yoke of the Unity" by use of the Shema. The representation of the late passage in Matthew that baptism was adopted by command of the risen Christ, and that he prescribed the Trini-

tarian formula in its administration, recalls the Trinitarian setting of Paul's reference to baptism in Eph. 4:4-6, and suggests a very early origin for this form of confession. But the Matthean command must be understood, of course, only in the sense that both the adoption of the rite itself, and of this formula of confession, were believed to have the approval of the glorified Lord. Utterances "in the Spirit" were doubtless the means by which this approval was expressed.

Paul's references to baptism have a distinctively "Pauline" coloration. To Paul the central idea of baptism seems to be (as in the sacrament of the cup) participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. "We are buried with him in baptism." When we emerge from the water it is a rising with him from the grave. When the Spirit comes upon the neophyte, to be henceforth a guiding divine presence in his life, it is like Israel's baptism unto Moses "in the cloud and in the sea." These Pauline comparisons undoubtedly represent an authentic meaning attaching to baptism. One could not be baptized without a real self-dedication responsive to that of Jesus, a real sharing in his renunciation of the world. In accepting his death "for all," it must be "in order that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again." For what Paul considers to be the

special religious needs of his hearers, he is quite justified in laying all stress on this particular aspect of the common initiatory rite. Nevertheless it can hardly be maintained that this was the dominant thought in the mind of those to whom its adoption was originally due. That which Paul never mentions in this connection, and indeed scarcely mentions at all, *repentance* unto remission of sins, is almost invariably [1] the chief significance of the rite wherever it is spoken of by any other New Testament author. Purification is the sense attaching to it both through intrinsic symbolism and by virtue of its actual employment in all ages. "Peter" and Ananias of Damascus commend baptism to the penitent to "wash away their sins" (Acts 2:38; 22:16).

To deny connection between Christian baptism and the rite introduced by Jesus' great forerunner would be folly. Certainly, in adopting baptism the primitive Christian brotherhood intended to take over its Johannine sense of initiation *through repentance* into the fellowship of a people prepared for the Coming. But the Christian rite was clearly distinguished from the Johannine. And not merely by the accompanying gifts of the Spirit, which were taken as a super-added witness of divine approval. Previous to this experience, and as a matter of

[1] Jn. 3:5 is perhaps the only exception, and constitutes one of the many proofs of Pauline influence in the Fourth Gospel.

intentional, human distinction, Christian baptism sought forgiveness of sins "in the name of Jesus," making his "grace" the ground of its appeal.[2] It was adopted as a token not merely of repentance, but of repentance *and faith.*

Doubtless even in proselyte baptism the convert signified by it his trust in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, a faith which took the place of allegiance to his old divinities. "Faith" in the forgiving mercy of Jehovah would therefore be more or less presupposed in the case of those who submitted to the baptism of John. Without it repentance would be of no avail. But it is made explicit in all references to Christian baptism. Faith is here emphasized for the same reason that the "glad tidings" of Jesus are so habitually contrasted with the somber warnings of the prophet of doom. Jesus brought hope, joy, assurance. He preached a kingdom "at hand"; yes, more: "among you." He proclaimed not merely a God *about* to intervene in judgment, but a *present* God, already at work to heal, to comfort, to forgive, to release from the bondage of Satan. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (as Paul delights to call the Being whom one might almost think he had never known before) was "living and active." Jesus' whole career had been

[2] The meaning of I Pt. 3:21, "demand (or "questioning") for a good conscience toward God," is too uncertain for employment of the passage here. See Bigg, *I. C. C. ad loc.*

shaped by the consciousness of his Father's presence; he had lived in this atmosphere. Hence "faith" is the key-note of his teaching. "Have faith in God" was his very watchword. If Christian baptism, then, signified repentance, it could not fail also to signify "faith toward God." The fact that this faith was now mediated "in the name of Jesus" made no difference in the lesson learned. The first disciples were baptized not merely because they had repented, but because they had repented *and believed.* "Joy," so frequently mentioned as following upon the rite, is a natural accompaniment of faith confirmed by experience of the Spirit. The neophyte was "begotten again unto a living hope" (I Pt. 1:3).

Moreover, the repentance and faith betokened by this baptism "into the name of Jesus" was believed to be "unto the forgiveness of sins." Those who submitted to it counted themselves to "belong to" Jesus, as the modern would say. Whether the suffering Jesus had undergone on God's account was supposed to add to the value of his intercession or not, it was certainly believed that acknowledgment by him in the presence of his Father and the holy angels was a sufficient guarantee of safety in the day of judgment. The "gifts of the Spirit," visible and audible to all, were a present pledge of his acceptance; for it was because the risen Christ had first "received it from the Father" that it had

been "poured forth" on his disciples. Baptism by water and the Spirit was therefore a seemingly complete expression of the primitive Christian's faith. It aimed to embody the whole apostolic message, and therefore is commanded as an accompaniment to it. Nevertheless, Paul can say "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." To Paul, "the gospel" was "the word of the cross."

Of course we are not to suppose that Paul had any quarrel with baptism as a rite expressive of the Christian message, at least not if the significance attaching to it in his own conception were clearly brought out. His unwillingness to take the office of a mere baptizer may lie partly in the subordinate rank belonging to it, but is expressed particularly in the contrasted phrase "to preach the gospel." Obviously there were, or at least might be, those who performed the rite without conveying what to Paul was the essence of the message. Indeed, reversion toward the original sense of "proselyte baptism," in which the convert renounced his former allegiance to heathen divinities and put his faith in Jehovah, would be an easy matter for Christians of Jewish birth. What else was it in substance which the Christian convert from heathenism did when he was baptized into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and took upon him the yoke of this Unity? Reversion toward Johannine baptism was

so easy that the Lukan sources see no difference in significance between the Johannine and the Christian rite. The difference, for Luke, lies solely in the subsequent appearance or non-appearance of the gifts of the Spirit. John's baptism too, as well as the Christian, is for Luke "unto remission of sins" (Lk. 3:3; contr. Mt. 3:1ff. and 26:28). This assumed identity is manifest further in the full description appended in Lk. 3:10-14 of the changed mode of life which must follow upon the repentance professed. To the evangelist, this is not the Johannine, but the Christian, mode of life. Still more apparent is the identity in Luke's mind from the fact that John's exhortation to the people (3:18) is spoken of as "the gospel," in connection with the fact that Luke gives no other account anywhere of the origin of Christian baptism. In Luke's conception, Christian baptism is nothing else on its human side save "the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins" which John preached. The fact that after the resurrection it was performed "in the name of Jesus" is taken as a matter of course. Of this supplement the risen Christ expresses his approval by the pouring forth of the Spirit. Contrariwise, the significance which Paul finds in baptism is self-devotion. He would hardly think it adequately described as a baptism "of repentance unto remission of sins," a rite which John could proclaim as easily as a Christian. Paul

never mentions the Baptist. His successor at Ephesus goes further. In answer to those who pointed to the Baptist as originator of the rite, he makes John explicitly deny that his baptism has any significance at all for repentance or remission of sins. Its only function is to make known the Christ. In Jn. 1:29-34 the Baptist directs his disciples to Jesus as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."

There are theologians, as we have seen, who regard Paul as responsible here for innovation. They question his insistence on "blood-atonement," and would take the Lukan representation as the more authentic. They consider Paul's doctrine of forgiveness "through the blood of the cross" as "legalistic" (!), a figment of "late Jewish theology," which the rabbi-apostle sought to impose on the unschooled Galilean followers of Jesus who had preceded him. But Paul himself is both explicit and emphatic in asserting the reverse of this. He had preached from the beginning the same gospel of salvation through the grace of God revealed in the death of Jesus. The change of attitude is the work of his opponents. The gospel which all had received as a common message was that "Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures." For fourteen years he had preached this, and at first his successes aroused only thanksgiving among "the churches of Judea." Afterward, objections were raised. Obstacles were

thrown in Paul's way which compelled him to appeal to the Pillars. With their endorsement he supposed he had silenced the opposition of the spying "false brethren." But when, after the first Missionary Journey, he returned with Barnabas to Antioch, he found the conflict had broken out anew. Peter had come down from Jerusalem and at first had acted wholly in harmony with Paul's understanding of the agreement. Afterward, under pressure from a delegation "from James," he had taken action which to Paul's mind involved a repudiation of vital elements of the faith. Paul can therefore describe it as rebuilding the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile which the cross had broken down, and can even declare that by implication the "grace of God" was thus "made void," and the martyrdom of Jesus useless.

As often happens, the skirmish over which the decisive battle was waged was in itself of minor importance, a mere question whether converted Jews such as Paul and Peter should or should not sacrifice their ceremonial "purity" by eating with their Gentile brethren. Peter saw no harm in yielding on this point to the delegation "from James," who came armed with some very awe-inspiring authority. Paul penetrated deeper. To him the issue was vital. It not only threatened the unity of the Church, but "the truth of the Gospel." His charge is that

by attempting to preserve their religious caste, Peter and "the rest of the Jews" have violated the principle all had stood for from the beginning, viz., that "a man is not justified by works of law but only by faith in Christ." By "justification" Paul means acquittal at the judgment-seat of God. By "faith in Christ" he means dependence on the intercession of the risen Lord. His conception of the scene of judgment appears in Rom. 8:33f. Satan accuses, Jesus pleads the believer's cause. The love of Jesus, proved by his devotion unto death, is our ground of confidence. It is so great, so strong, so divine (for Jesus was simply the agent of the Father in his redemptive work), that no power, angelic or Satanic, in earth or heaven, can avail against it. Reliance on this "love of God in Christ" must be absolute. The effort to supplement it by retaining something from the old Jewish status of ceremonial purity, especially if the effort involves some slight put upon "the brother for whom Christ died," is intolerable. It is an avowal of lack of faith. Real faith requires that all alike stand on one level, the level of "sinners" seeking forgiveness through the grace of the Lord Jesus *and nothing else.*

In this challenge to Peter, Paul certainly takes the ground that the delegates "from James" are the innovators. They are shifting the emphasis from justification to sanctification, from gospel back to

law. Peter in yielding to them has been false to a vital principle belonging to the very essence of the original and common message. We have shown that Paul's language indicates the basis of his claim. In using the phrase, "Who loved me and gave himself for me," Paul shows that he has reference to the utterance of Jesus at the Supper: "My body, my blood, which is *given for you.*" The infallibly saving "love of God in Christ" is that which is thus "commended to us" in that God gave his Son in this manner according to the Isaian Servant-song. Unless, then, it can be shown that Paul is in some way importing into the Supper ritual a sense not warranted by the institution itself, we have no alternative. His witness is by far the most ancient and authentic that we possess. Repeatedly, emphatically, and explicitly, he asserts this as the very heart of the primitive, common faith and message. Like the heralds of glad tidings to Israel of whom Isaiah had spoken, all apostles and ministers of the word were ambassadors of peace and reconciliation to the sinful world. They were charged to proclaim as the message of the Reconciliation how that God had thus effected atonement, and was no more imputing unto men their trespasses. The Galatian passage is no less conclusive than the Corinthian. It is even more direct and personal. The love of God manifested in the self-devotion of Jesus was Peter's own

personal ground of hope for "justification," no less than Paul's. To disprove Paul's assertion of his own fidelity to the original content of the gospel, and controvert his charge that it was being obscured and evaded as a stumbling-block by the party who claimed the support of James, it must be shown that the action of Jesus in instituting the Supper was not intended to bear this sense.

It is true that the Lukan writings contain an account of the Supper in which everything indicative of Jesus' having "sanctified" himself to obtain forgiveness for Israel is conspicuous by its absence. This omission goes hand in hand with the entire doctrine of salvation of the Lukan sources, and their complete misconception of Paul. With the best of intentions, Luke gives only the direct opposite of Paul's defense of both his apostleship and his gospel. Luke's contention is that God raised up Jesus to be both Lord and Christ. Admit this, and there is no reason why every Pharisee of the Sanhedrin should not agree to Paul's doctrine. He teaches absolutely nothing but what "all the prophets have spoken." He has lived always in all good conscience according to the law, setting an example in this respect to "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" (Acts 21:21ff.). According to Luke, Paul found no new gospel, or religious faith, in Christian-

ity. He merely discovered that Jesus was the real Messiah, instead of some other whom he had been expecting. Afterward, as before, sinners are saved by repentance and faith. Why should not John the Baptist declare the meaning of Christian baptism as well as any within the kingdom? Such is the conception of Luke. Our question is whether the sources to which Luke has resorted do not represent precisely that reaction toward Judaism, with evasion of the obnoxious doctrine of the cross, of which Paul accused his opponents. The passage quoted from II Esdr. 7:102-115, strongly rejecting the idea of intercession or mediation in the final judgment, and the Talmudic anecdote of R. Eliezer b. Durdaia [3] commending repentance as against intercession, afford ample proof how little fault need be found by truly orthodox Jews with Christianity, if only this stumbling-block were removed.

But why support Paul in preference to Luke? Jesus himself did not teach the Isaian doctrine of the Servant as applying specifically to himself. That was a discovery *after* Calvary. Why may not Paul have obtained his idea of "blood-atonement" from Peter and others who were "apostles before" him? What reason have we to suppose that Jesus "dedi-

[3] *Abodah Zarah* 17a. Quoted by C. G. Montefiore in *Beginnings of Christianity* I, p. 71.

cated his body and blood that God might be gracious to his people"? Why hold, with Paul, that he "gave himself for our sins"?

Paul undoubtedly did hear this "gospel of the reconciliation" from the very first moment that he became a Christian. Moreover, the teaching was based not on any specific utterance of Jesus, but directly on "the Scriptures." So far as our very imperfect means of determining individual responsibility allow, it is to Peter, rather than to Jesus himself, that we owe the first application of the Isaian passage to the death and resurrection of Jesus. But Peter's word was very far from being Paul's *only* source of knowledge. We do not refer to James, who was not present at the Supper. We refer to the fact that Paul had long been a persecutor before he became a Christian, and must have known why he persecuted. Surely he makes it clear that he persecuted because his victims held to a doctrine of forgiveness through the suffering and intercession of the martyred Jesus. To use his own theologizing terms, they held to a doctrine of "justification by faith apart from works of law." We have cited Hegesippus' account of the martyrdom of James to show in more Jewish form where the objection lay. The "scribes and Pharisees" beg James to take his stand at Passover on the pinnacle of the temple to counteract the error (πλανή) which is sweep-

ing away the people after "Jesus the crucified." They hope that James will acknowledge that "the gate of Jesus" is not a mode of entrance into the messianic inheritance outside the prescriptions of the law. In other words the issue is: Law or "grace."

In Hegesippus' story of the martyrdom, the Son-of-Man doctrine is but slightly tinged with the Servant doctrine; but there is no mistaking the onus of the charge that the people are being led into error in the name of "Jesus the crucified." The objection is that another "gate of salvation" is thus offered, a "righteousness" (or "justification") apart from works of law. The legal saintliness of James "the Just" had led "the scribes and Pharisees" to think he might deny the fundamental Christian doctrine of mediation or intercession. An early Jewish-Christian gospel [4] also depicts the mother and brethren of Jesus as more interested than he in John's baptism "for forgiveness of sins." This story may preserve a trace of the proclivity of the "mother and brethren." But the James of Hegesippus preferred martyrdom to denial of the new "gate of salvation."

Paul's persecution had the same motive as that of "the scribes and Pharisees" in the martyrdom of James. But unless the impression we get from

[4] The *Gospel of the Nazarenes.* See Preuschen, *Antilegomena,* p. 4.

his Epistles is misleading, the element of "Jesus the crucified" was quite as prominent at this early time as the element of the return from the right hand of power as Son of Man. It was the former, not the latter, which aroused the mortal opposition of Saul the Pharisee. It was this which for all his life thereafter made the contrast absolute between salvation through obedience to law, and salvation through "the blood of the cross."

How, then, came this opposition to pass? Whence this universal conviction among all Christians, from the very earliest times, that the martyrdom of Jesus had opened a new "gate of salvation"? For, be it observed, even those forms of Christian doctrine most remote from the Pauline maintain at least that men are saved "by the grace of the Lord Jesus." Peter and James, as well as Paul, hold to forgiveness of sins for Jesus' sake. Jewish as well as Gentile converts are baptized "into the name of Jesus" that they may be counted as belonging to him and receive the benefit of his intercession on their behalf. The Lukan sources may have allowed a disappearance of the idea that the *suffering* of the Servant played any part in the effectiveness of his intercession; but they certainly retain dependence on the intercession itself. Whence this extraordinary belief? Was this a mere inference from Scripture, unwarranted by any utterance of Jesus himself? Or is

Paul correct in maintaining that Jesus "gave himself for our sins"? Is he just in ascribing the obscuration of this central fact to Jewish-Christian reactionaries who desired "not to be persecuted for the cross of Christ"?

It is worth observing that Paul's accusation nowhere, so far as our knowledge extends, meets direct denial. No one ventures to allege that Jesus did *not* make this self-dedication for sins. Indeed, the doctrine is more explicitly alleged in I Pt. 2:24 than in any writing of Paul. It comes more vividly to the fore in those documents which belong in the category of martyrology, such as Hebrews and Revelation. But it is not denied even in James. In Mark, and even in Matthew, it is directly alleged that Jesus, at the farewell Supper, did make this self-dedication of his body and blood "for the many," Matthew adding explicitly "for the remission of sins." [5] The allegation nowhere meets denial. It is only canceled in the later forms of the story. It disappears in silence, and is only faintly revived in the writings of the great follower of Paul at Ephesus.

For even "John," as we call him, gives no *interpretation* of the doctrine. He speaks of Jesus as "the Lamb of God." He is "the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of

[5] The transfer of the clause "for the forgiveness of sins" (Mk. 1:4) from Mt. 1:6 to 26:28 should be studied in the light of the addition Mt. 3:13-15.

the whole world." Nicodemus must be taught that the lifting up of the Son of Man on the cross, as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, is a demonstration of divine love working salvation in the judgment for those who have faith. But John offers no explanation of this gospel of grace. Paul alone interprets and defends it. The issue was raised at Antioch in Paul's protest against the pressure exerted by "those from James." But for a century thereafter "the gospel of grace" in its Pauline form seems to lose more ground than it gains. It has nominal acceptance by his churches, but clear understanding is lacking, and ultimately the doctrine is revived only in the grotesque forms of medieval deductions from the Epistles.

The validity of Paul's theology is a question which must still be held in reserve. We express no opinion on this point even when we now raise the ultimate question of the historian of Church doctrine: Did Jesus himself lay the foundation for Paul's teaching by any word or act which really implies it? Did he himself really make it a part of the Apostolic Message to say that his body and blood were dedicated in martyrdom that Jehovah might be "reconciled" to his people? The fact has been denied. Paul's statements have been discounted as a rabbinic importation. The other New Testament writings which repeat the doctrine of "propitiation" are said to owe

it to Pauline influence. Is this the fact? Before we attempt to deal with the question on its merits, determining what validity, if any, attaches to the Apostle's belief, we must do our best to settle this historical problem: Did Jesus use the words ascribed to him by Paul; and if so, in what sense?

So far as alleged promises of intercession are concerned, the question of fact need hardly be raised. It is true that modern discussion tends to neglect this feature of the Atonement doctrine, all-important as it was in antiquity. But the early witnesses are unanimous on this point. Paul can even maintain that "if Christ be not raised" we are "yet in our sins." As we have just seen, his whole mental picture of "justification" is that of the intercession of Jesus before the heavenly judgment-seat, where Satan appears as the great Accuser, with any number of possible allies, angelic or demonic. Jesus is the Christian's Advocate in heaven. Without an advocate to intercede for him with God, he would be "of all men most miserable." And this belief in intercession is not that of Paul alone. It pervades every writing of the New Testament. In Hebrews it dominates the picture of the eternal High Priest, who intercedes perpetually for all who are of faith. In the Lukan writings it is just as conspicuous as in Paul. It cannot be dissociated from prayer "in the name of Jesus," nor from baptism "into his

name." Students of primitive Christian doctrine will concede the universality of this belief, whether they share it or not. The contrast of Lukan and Pauline teaching is not on the point of Jesus' intercession on behalf of his adherents, but on the question whether his sacrificial death has weight in the matter, to make his intercession more effective.

The belief of primitive Christians in the intercession of the risen Christ is shown by sayings ascribed to Jesus in which confession or denial on his part before the heavenly judgment-seat is made contingent on confession or denial of him before human tribunals. This is embodied in the liturgical hymn already quoted:

> If we die with him we shall also live with him:
> If we suffer we shall also reign with him:
> If we deny him he also will deny us.

Surely there is nothing incredible in the claim to such a promise. It would be natural to Jesus in the later days of the ministry, when the shadow of the cross was covering more and more of the horizon, to promise to loyal followers acknowledgment before the divine tribunal (Mt. 10:32f.=Lk. 12:8f.). Hope, to endure at all, was compelled at that time to enter upon things "within the veil." Indeed, one can hardly imagine Jesus sustaining the faltering faith of his disciples otherwise than by such assurances as these. Neither can the reawakening of

faith after the great catastrophe, especially its reawakening in the particular form of a baptism into Jesus' name "for the remission of sins," be reasonably accounted for unless it could look back to actual assurances of the risen Lord to this effect.

Conceding then, that the expectation of intercession in heaven by Jesus was as universal among primitive Christians as baptism into his name, and that so universal a belief almost certainly rests upon an assurance on his part substantially of the character of that ascribed to him, what shall we say of the inherent probability of Paul's emphatic testimony that Jesus at the farewell Supper reënforced this assurance of intercession for "his own" (Jn. 13:1) by declaring that his body and blood were dedicated in their behalf?

It is difficult for moderns, so long unaccustomed to the conceptions of national religion, to go back in imagination to those of our faith before it had been fully denationalized, to the time when Jesus could think of his own mission as at least primarily limited to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," when the Reconciliation meant, at least primarily, that reconciliation of Jehovah to his alienated people to which Isaiah had looked forward. It is doubly difficult for Protestants, among whom the sense of organic unity in a "catholic" Church has become so deplorably vague and shadowy, to transfer this

sense of national solidarity, as primitive Christians so easily did, from the "election" of the Old Testament to the "Israel of God" of the New. This it is, no doubt, which makes it sound strangely to us when Paul says (Eph. 5:25) that "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself up for it," and even Luke in reporting Paul's speech at Miletus (Acts 20:28) can speak of the Church as "bought with his own blood" (though Luke here avoids, as always, the idea that Jesus' blood was shed "for the remission of sins"). Primitive Christians certainly found it easy and natural to hold that as other heroes, leaders, and martyrs had dedicated their lives on the battlefield, in martyrdom, or at the altar for the welfare of their people, so Jesus had "given himself up" for the Church.[6] Were they correct in this belief; or must we hold that Paul's charges against Judaizing Christians of a timid obscuration of "the blood of the cross" were unjustified?

Without transgressing the limits of purely historical inquiry, it is legitimate to argue from the ethical teachings of Jesus as a whole that he cannot have intended by any utterance at the Supper to introduce a doctrine of "substitutionary atonement" such as has been taught since medieval times in the

[6] Ignatius, on his way to martyrdom, repeatedly employs the same figure of the ἀντίψυχον (life given as ransom for another, IV. Macc. 6:27). Thus *ad Eph.* xxi., *ad Smyrn.* x., *ad Polyc.* ii. and vi.

Church, and is even imputed to Paul by some modern critics. We have seen that contemporary Jewish morality recoiled from any such invasion of the principle of individual responsibility, regarding any such abuse of the principle of solidarity *(zechuth)* as immoral. If the writer of II Esdras explicitly repudiates any such doctrine, if Paul insists on the inviolability of the law of retribution (Gal. 6:7), if he repels with indignation the imputation of his opponents that his doctrine of "grace" "makes Christ a minister of sin," that it allows men to say: "Let us sin the more, that grace may abound," surely we cannot imagine that on this moral issue Jesus was less sensitive. We will leave the question whether Paul's doctrine was "substitutionary" for later reply. But it may be set down at once as certain that no such doctrine was ever taught by Jesus. On historical grounds it may reasonably be maintained that the words imputed to him are either incorrectly reported, or must be understood in a sense not involving violation of the principle of individual moral accountability. It would not be reasonable to impute to him a doctrine of substitutionary atonement.

On the other hand, modern interpreters are too prone to forget that Jesus was not a missionary of Christianity. We are dealing with times when the aim in view was to gather the lost sheep of the house of Israel, to win back the nation to its divine

allegiance, to secure the Reconciliation of Jehovah to his people through their repentance and obedience. Denationalization was still to come. Jesus was striving for the salvation of his own people, the sons and daughters of Abraham, and bidding his followers join him in the perils of the struggle. Something may be said for those who refuse to believe that he accepted the title of Messiah, or undertook a national rôle of any kind, if they also refuse to see anything but pure individualistic morality in his teaching. It is at least consistent. But if we hold that Jesus did in some sense claim to be "the Christ," we cannot consistently deny that he considered his calling to be a *national* one, at least during these parting hours of the supreme crisis. When we turn to his farewell message, that message which lies embedded in the only rite transmitted directly from his own hands, antecedent even to that wherein the Apostles endeavored to enshrine their teaching, it is well to bear this in mind, and to interpret accordingly. Let us see what this implies.

In Jesus' time the opposing principles of national solidarity and individual responsibility were still unreconciled. Indeed from the days of Ezekiel and Isaiah onward, the plain man of simple faith and devotion had found it difficult to follow the logic of the theologian when he wished to apply the same rule of solidarity in opposite senses. How could one

maintain that the "anger," "alienation," "displeasure" of the national divinity (whatever the phrase employed to designate national calamity regarded as an infliction of divine providence) was due to particular wicked acts of the sovereign or of representative individuals among the people, and in the same breath deny that acts of heroic devotion on God's account by sovereigns or other representative leaders among the people had any effect to secure a restoration of right relations. We cannot excuse retention of the term "the wrath" on the ground that it was only a figure of speech, and not admit the figurative nature of the converse expressions for "forgiveness," "propitiation," "reconciliation," or whatever other term was applied to signify divine help and approval? If we reject nationalism in religion altogether, as well as every other kind of solidarity, we may then with good logic and consistency reject simultaneously the doctrine that the nation suffers by reason of the sins of individuals and also the doctrine that it is advantaged by the heroic devotion of individuals. But if accepted at all, the rule of solidarity must work both ways. And in the age and environment of Jesus religion *was* national. The men whose ideas of religion he shares did hold a doctrine of God's displeasure being due to the sins of individual sons of Abraham. Some, at least, held also the converse doctrine that Israel

was in some special sense "beloved" of God "for the fathers' sake" (Rom. 11:28). Jewish patriots believed that if national calamity was due to the sin of individuals, God's favor to the nation might also be won by individual deeds of sacrificial heroism. They did *not* regard this as conflicting with their strong sense of individual moral accountability.

For we have also found (and the evidence is all the more convincing because of the resulting opposition) that since the days of the Maccabean martyrs, at least the common people in Israel had drawn this inference. They held that Jehovah was "propitiated" by those who freely gave their lives "for the sanctification of the Name." Men who out of love for Jehovah's Law, or devotion to what they regarded as the interests of his kingdom, gave their bodies to be burned in martyrdom were believed to have accomplished something toward the longed-for Reconciliation. The classic example of self-devotion to obtain national forgiveness was the "Atonement" offered at Horeb by Moses after the people's sin (Ex. 32:30ff.). This was compared with the self-sacrifice of the suffering Servant of Is. 53:12. In *Pirke Aboth* V, 21, we find a formula which elucidates Mk. 10:45 and 14:24, showing what was understood by the "redemption" or "justification" of "the many":

> Whosoever makes the many righteous, sin prevails not over him; and whosoever makes the many to sin, no place of repentance is granted to him. Moses was righteous and made the many righteous, and the righteousness (or "justification") of the many is laid upon him.

This reference to the self-devotion of Moses when he offered his own life to obtain forgiveness for the people belongs to contemporary Jewish teaching concerning the "mediation" of Moses. It must be kept in mind when we seek to interpret the gospel phrases, "give his life a ransom *for many*," "This is my blood which is poured out *for many*."

In the Markan form the phrase "for (ἀντί) many" is more or less open to the objection that it leaves room for a "substitutionary" doctrine of the Atonement. The preposition ἀντί has precisely this sense of substitution "instead of." Without the *national* sense attaching properly to the term, "the many" might be interpreted in a substitutionary sense. Doubtless it is because of this objectionable doctrine that both the Markan passages which contain the phrase are omitted in the Lukan parallel. But for what other reason can it be that ἀντί is never employed by Paul? At least it should give pause to those who call Paul's doctrine "substitutionary," when we observe that a more cautious theologian than Mark, keenly alive to the moral objections raised against his gospel of grace, invariably expresses it in terms which avoid this implication.

Paul always speaks of the suffering of Jesus as "for our advantage" (ὑπέρ), or (with adoption of the Isaian phrase) as a sacrifice "for" (περί) sin.

Neither the popular disposition to look upon self-devotion as "propitiatory," nor the protest of individual morality against it, were new in Jesus' time. Micah puts in the mouth of Balak the question:

> Shall I give my first-born for my transgression?
> The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?

In fact, all antiquity rings with the tragic effort thus to win the favor of a frowning Providence. Just as Jeremiah and the prophets are obliged to protest that piacular sacrifices never entered the mind of Jehovah, just as the story of Isaac is related in Gen. 22:1-19 for the very purpose of proving this, and to show that God requires nothing but an obedient spirit, so in later times down to those of the medieval Synagogue, the Rabbis still oppose abuse of what they term the doctrine of "Akedah" (that is, "the Binding of Isaac"). How near the doctrine comes to its Christian counterpart may be judged from the following prayer of the Jewish ritual for the New Year:

> Remember in our favor, O Lord our God, the oath which thou hast sworn to our father Abraham on Mount Moriah; consider the binding of his son Isaac upon the altar, when he suppressed his love in order to do thy will with a whole

heart. Thus may thy love suppress thy wrath against us, and through thy great goodness may the heat of thine anger be turned away from thy people, thy city and thine heritage. . . . To-day remember in mercy the Binding of Isaac in favor of his seed.

Its history in the Synagogue is told by Landsberg in *The Jewish Encyclopædia* (I, p. 303a). The earliest allusion to the doctrine is found in the Mishna (*Ta'anith* ii. 4). But popular faith refused to be satisfied.

In the course of time ever greater importance was attached to the "Akedah." The haggadistic literature is full of allusions to it; the claim to forgiveness on its account was inserted in the daily morning prayer; and a piece called "Akedah" was added to the liturgy of each of the penitential days among the German Jews.

As we have seen, Jewish teachers sought to guard against the idea that *zechuth* could constitute a treasury of merit for the benefit of individual Israelites, themselves unworthy. In his *Religion des Judenthums* (1903, p. 182) Bousset explains that

This treasury of merit belongs to the collective body. The Synagogue refuses to authorize the individual to take comfort in it. It developed no means or institutions through which anything could be appropriated to the individual, whether in this life or the other, from this treasury of supererogatory merit.

The reason for the distinction appears more clearly in what we have already quoted from Burton regarding the limitation of atonement through the suffer-

ing of martyrs to *national* forgiveness. Landsberg also, in the article just cited, protests against the conception of "Akedah" as "a claim to atonement," and declares that "even in the Talmud, voices are raised in condemnation" of this idea.

But *national* atonement is a living doctrine of the Synagogue to-day. One need but turn to the ancient *Abinu Malkenu* ("Our Father, our King"), which in the Jewish Book of Common Prayer still sets the key-note for observance of the Great Day of Atonement, to appreciate that the idea of *national* forgiveness as won, at least in part, through the sufferings of martyred devotees is not obsolete. The prayer entreats God to "turn from his wrath," to "repent him of the evil against his people," to "have mercy, and deliver, and pardon their sins for his name's sake." And the appeal is:

> Do this for the sake of them that were slaughtered for thy Unity;
> Do it for the sake of them that went through fire and through water for the Sanctification of thy Name.

We are not, then, properly and historically interpreting the Synoptic Record if we fail to remember this distinction between national and individual *zechuth*. Even if Jesus used the form of direct address: "This my body, my blood, is given for *you*," the meaning is not that *as individuals* the Twelve should have this right of appeal against an adverse

sentence in the day of judgment, still less that he would make his sufferings a substitute for the penalty they might have otherwise to bear. It may be that a Pauline tendency to individualize has affected the wording of the record. If not, the meaning is collective: "My body and blood are freely given that you *as a new Israel of God* may receive his favor. As heroes and martyrs of former times gave their lives that Jehovah might be reconciled again to his people, so I now give mine."

It was not, then, in violation of the principle of individual accountability that Jesus made the offering of his body and blood. If we admit the fact, we must hold that it was for "the Church," which, as even Luke tells us, was "bought with his blood." Paul, for excellent reasons, individualizes in applying this proof of the "love of Christ" to the case of himself and Peter in Gal. 2:14-21. But when in Eph. 5:25 he substitutes "the Church" for "the people of God," Paul is simply reverting to the general understanding of primitive Christian interpreters. The fourth evangelist has coined a phrase more exactly to his purpose, but expressive of the same collective body, when he introduces his description of the farewell Supper with the words: "Having loved *his own that were in the world,* Jesus loved them unto the end." These later terms are substitutes for an earlier patriotic ideal that filled the eye

of Jesus. He died as the noblest of Jewish patriots, consecrating himself in martyrdom to the ideal of a people of God restored to Jehovah's favor through the devotion of its representatives. He died for the sovereignty of Jehovah's kingdom and the sanctification of his name, in the hope that the Kingdom would be given "to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

PART III

THE GOSPEL FOR OUR OWN TIME.

CHAPTER XI.

GOSPEL AND THEOLOGY

AFTER the great tragedy on Calvary, the reassembled band of disciples completed their number according to the twelve tribes of Israel, by the addition of one from their own company and of their own type. But it pleased God to add another of very different type. To the Twelve, who looked upon their mission as "an apostleship to the circumcision," a mission to tell the story of what they had seen and heard, God added one theologian.

Now it is the business of the theologian to view events *sub specie æternitatis*. Like all other scientists, the theologian generalizes from particulars. Like all other scientists, he specializes ordinary common sense, doing more systematically and methodically what every man does who reasons at all. In fact, no valid knowledge of God exists, save that which rests upon such inference from experienced phenomena. Our idea of God is our interpretation of history. Consequently, Paul also interpreted the career and fate of Jesus, together with its effect upon believers, including his own experience, as part of

the self-manifestation of God in human history. It is providential that the interpretation came early, before the eye-witnesses had disappeared.

But Paul was a Jew, and conceived human history from the point of view of a Jew of his period and environment. He was necessarily limited to contemporary modes of conception and expression. These conceptual forms Paul shares with those who were apostles before him. They are transitory and incidental. What he does not share with his predecessors is a theological world-view, an application of the story of Jesus to the problem of redemption. As regards this insight into the meaning of the tragedy, Paul knows no predecessor. It is his own peculiar "revelation of the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit." Paul universalizes the message, so that the Gentiles are seen to be "fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel." From what had been the simple story of Jesus, Paul constructs a philosophy of redemption. It is the validity of this "revelation" of Paul, this interpretation of the Apostolic Message, which forms our final subject of inquiry.

The claim of Paul to have been added by divine authority to the number of the Twelve was not al-

together welcome. There was no little opposition. Paul's "revelation," transforming the Jewish national faith into a universal religion, was questioned. His answer was to point to results. The fruits of the Spirit resulted from the preaching of his "gospel." The decision reached at the conference with the Pillars was a momentous one. Paul's determination to lay the question before the brother of Jesus and the two leading Apostles at Jerusalem had come only under what he regarded as divine direction. The question really concerns the right of the theologian. Had Paul—have we—the right to universalize? To the everlasting credit of James and Cephas and John, they answered this question fully and unreservedly in the affirmative. That decision was made in the true spirit of Jesus and can never be reversed. Decisions of councils, beginning with the so-called Apostolic Council and its abortive "decrees," which attempted to superadd new conditions to the covenant once made, are as nothing to it. The appeal had been to the living Spirit; and the living Spirit which prompted the appeal received the verdict. The endorsement of Paul's gospel at Jerusalem is the justification of theology.

Had the issue been that of mere history, Paul had no case. Our own review of the story goes to show, were demonstration needful, that Paul's opponents knew better than he the actual, historical Jesus.

They could not fail to understand that the "love of Christ" to which Paul made his appeal as a matter of personal, individual trust for all sinners throughout all time had not *historically* been thus individualized and universalized. Historically, as we have seen, the closest parallel to "the love of Christ" would be the self-devotion of Jewish patriots and martyrs who have died in whole-hearted "love" for Jehovah, and with the words of devotion on their lips. If, like Paul's Judaizing opponents, we limit our religious faith to matters of historical record in the sayings and doings of Jesus, we must be satisfied with a doctrine of "limited Atonement." We may extend the meaning of the words "his own" in the account given by the fourth evangelist of this unstinted "love." With the author of Hebrews, we may think of the great Martyr as looking forward with joy to a boundless prospect spread out before him. We may hold that beyond the immediate circle of his fellow-countrymen he had also on the horizon of his thought a new Israel to whom Jehovah might be "reconciled" after his sacrificial death. We may hold that thus in a certain remote and derived sense Jesus "loved *the Church* and gave himself up for it." But this is still a doctrine of "limited" atonement. Christ dies for "the elect." Surely, in any strict historical sense it will be impossible to maintain that Jesus consciously gave himself up as a "propiti-

ation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." The basis of such a claim is not historical, but theological. It must rest where Paul rested it, on the doctrine that the "love" in question was the love of God "in" Christ. To individualize we must universalize.

It seems to have been through the Isaian teaching of the suffering Servant that Paul came to this faith. Paul holds that, in the self-devotion of Jesus, God commends *his own* love to sinful men. So the Isaian prophecy presents the sacrificial death of the Servant as the act of God. It is the means by which *God* achieves his redemptive purpose for an alienated world. But with Paul this doctrine of the redeeming love of God seems to be far more than a mere inference from prophecy. It hinges on his larger, more mystical belief expressed in the declaration that "the Lord *is* the Spirit." In the self-devotion of Jesus Paul had *discovered* God. He had found, in the language of his great follower at Ephesus, that "God is love, and whosoever loveth is begotten of God and knoweth God."

Still we may ask, Whence came this mystical interpretation of the work of Christ? Had Paul's incarnation doctrine any other basis than that of all mysticism, which, in his time as in ours, refuses to draw a line between human agency and divine determination? Certainty is not attainable here, nor is

it needful. Traces can be found in prechristian Hellenistic Judaism of a doctrine of the incarnation of the divine spirit of Wisdom. This Alexandrian mysticism may have had some influence on Paul's philosophy. Again, a certain foreshadowing of Paul's own view of the working of "the Spirit of God" appears in our best record of the teaching of Jesus. Jesus distinguishes his own personality from that of "the Spirit of God" which works through him in his Galilean ministry to release the captive, to give sight to the blind, to restore to Israel its lost national life. If Paul extends this teaching to include the culmination of Jesus' work on Calvary, making the love of Christ which found supreme expression there to be also an expression of "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," the step was logical. In reality it is but a unification of the message. It combines the significance of both symbols of the faith. Both the Galilean ministry of healing and forgiveness, the continued outpouring of "the Spirit" of the Anointed Servant, and the ministry of Calvary thus reach an ultimate unity. Both together constitute the ministry of the Reconciliation. Both together manifest "the love of God which is *in* Christ Jesus our Lord."

To do full justice to Paul we must distinguish his "gospel" from his theology. His theology was his own interpretation of certain data which others

were at liberty to interpret otherwise, but which had an intrinsic meaning in the purpose of God. These data constituted a message with which Paul and other "ambassadors" of peace to the world had been divinely "intrusted." The message constituted Paul's "gospel." His theology was built upon it. The theology was of necessity to a large extent polemic, and of course subject to change as further insight or development might require. We must first of all look behind Paul's theology for his "gospel," resorting to his theology only for the light it throws upon the message it defends and interprets.[1]

Paul's practical aim was the admission of his Gentile converts to a position of recognized equality with believers of Jewish birth and mode of life, without any Mosaic requirement. But the principle on which he rested this demand was novel. It made of Christianity as against Judaism a new religion. Judaism (at least Judaism as Paul looked back upon it) was a religion of law. Salvation had become for the Jew a reward of merit. This was the tendency of legalism in spite of the stress laid upon God's long-suffering. God's judgment would not be without mercy save to those who had shown no mercy. All that could be said or done in favor of the culprit would enter into consideration. Nevertheless, there was no explicit ground in Judaism on which to set

[1] Cf. K. Lake, *Earlier Ep.*, p. 233, note.

aside the general verdict of condemnation. The Law was definite and explicit in pronouncing the divine penalty upon sin. Granting the Law to be what rabbinic teaching declared, some new principle must enter in, or there was no escape from its penalty for any son of Adam. The new principle which Paul found was the doctrine of "grace"; and he applied it in a temporal sense. Accepting the rabbinic idea of the infallible divinity of the Torah, he gave to the Law a temporary and provisional application. It covered a definite period, the period from Moses to Christ, from four hundred and thirty years after Abraham to the sixteenth year of Tiberius. At the definite date of 30 A.D. God had introduced a new mode of administration of human affairs. He gave the demonstration of his own love toward sinners "in" Christ. For what Jesus had done *as Messiah* must be accounted the act of God who sent him. The primary sources of this doctrine of the cross we have found to lie in Jewish martyrology.

Paul's special theory of divine "economics" is framed to meet the objection: What, then, of the Law? He could not answer his opponents as a modern might, by appealing to historical interpretation. He could not say: The Mosaic legislation is obsolete through lapse of time and the further evolution of religious ideas. Evolution was an idea as yet unborn. Paul's equivalent for it is the doctrine of

a new divine "dispensation." At a predetermined time (Gal. 4:2), after men have been long enough under angelic "stewards and governors" to learn what the Law was intended to teach, God brings them through faith into a different relation with himself, a relation of sonship. His method of doing this is to "send forth his Son" to show men what divine love is by Jesus' act of self-devotion on the cross.

Here the particular debate is about the divine nature of the Law. If Paul had not been forced, or supposed himself forced, to defend this in his argument with Christians of Jewish birth, we should not have had his peculiar doctrine of the cross as abolishing the Law. But his argument presupposes something as a postulate common to Paul and his Judaizing opponents, viz., that in accepting the cross Jesus *did* something which demonstrated this love of God on which sinners may rely. The common postulate on which the argument is built may safely be taken as universal Christian doctrine. Jesus "gave himself up" for the forgiveness of sins. That is Paul's "gospel" which he "received," together with all other heralds of the cross, from the beginning. The polemic superstructure of argument against the Judaizers on the question of the permanence or impermanence of the Law is a matter of academic interest, which concerns the historian rather than the believer of to-day.

The appeal to this received common "gospel" is constant in Paul's letters because that is the vital feature of the message which he believes to be imperiled. We have seen it again and again. The earliest instance is in some respects the most instructive. Paul thinks it imperiled by Peter's yielding at Antioch to the authority of the delegates "from James." Immediately he challenges Peter to say whether forgiveness of sins ("justification") depends on the love of God shown in Jesus' act of sacrifice, or on something else. If we have put our faith in that love, it is only unfaith to cling to rags and tatters from the old Mosaic system of "purity." Paul "died to the Law." The life which he now lives is a life of faith in "the Son of God who loved me and *gave himself up* for me." Hence his salutation in the same letter is a blessing from "Jesus Christ, who *gave himself* for our sins."

The battle for his apostleship and gospel was carried further in Corinth than even in Galatia. The climax of Paul's defense is reached in II Cor. 5:14-21. Here we first encounter the technical term by which he describes the Apostolic Message, the Isaian figure of the Reconciliation. "The love of Christ" who "died for all" is the constraining power. The man who has shared morally in this death and resurrection and thus belongs to Christ, or, to use Paul's expression, is "in" Christ, is part of a new creation.

Through the work accomplished in his Father's name by Jesus, God has restored us to his favor ("reconciled us to himself" [2]). To all who proclaim the gospel, God has given this "ministry of the Reconciliation." They received it as their commission to tell all men that God, through the agency of Christ, had been restoring the world to his favor, not reckoning unto them their trespasses. This was the "word of the Reconciliation" committed to apostles of the faith. Like ambassadors of peace from God, like the heralds of glad tidings of peace whose feet Isaiah had seen in vision on the mountains bringing the assurance to Zion that her warfare was ended, Paul and his associates in this "ministry of the new covenant" had been sent to entreat the world on behalf of Christ to avail themselves of this sacrifice for sin made by Jesus to win the renewed favor of God.

The Isaian origin of this conception of the Reconciliation will hardly be disputed. In the Double Tradition material of the Gospels (Q) this is the general theme of Jesus' own proclamation of "glad tidings to the poor." He assures broken-hearted Israel that the day of its "consolation" has come.

[2] To guard against a very wide-spread misapplication of the term "reconciliation," it may be well to append an extract from Thayer's *Lexicon of New Testament Greek* defining καταλλάσσειν. "In the New Testament God is said καταλλάσσειν ἑαυτῷ τινα *to receive one into his favor* A. V. *"reconcile* one to himself, II Cor. 5:18 sq." Cf. Ecclus. 16:11, where God is declared "mighty to reconcile" (i.e. forgive) and also "to pour out wrath."

The evidences of mercy and healing which attend his summons to repentance are proof of it. Especially is it proved by the turning again of the publicans and sinners in a Great Repentance. This is part of the primitive-Christian doctrine of the Servant. But it is not all. To Paul the utterances of the farewell Supper come to bear out and complete this Isaian conception. Jesus was not only the Anointed, but also the Suffering Servant, who was "delivered up" as a sin-offering, and that for foreign nations as well as for his own people. When he "became obedient even unto the death of the cross," the act simply crowned his ministry of the Reconciliation, putting upon it the capstone of supreme devotion. Paul uses the terms of Jewish martyrology when he speaks of "the wrath" and "the reconciliation." He protests against the omission of this element from the preaching of the gospel. Has it, or has it not, something to add to the Message?

We have maintained that Paul's doctrine of the cross represents the spirit of Hebrew martyrology. The statement will not be admitted without inquiry into the earlier use of the term "Reconciliation" (καταλλαγή), which the King James translators rendered "Atonement." It belongs exclusively to Jewish martyrology. The two employments of the verb in the ordinary secular sense of "change" in Is. 9:5 and Jer. 31:39 have, of course, no bearing

on the case. In the religious sense of change *in the attitude of God toward* Israel, the term is the classical one for the stories of martyrdom related in the later Maccabean literature. The martyrs offer their lives to remove that divine displeasure (the "wrath" of God) under which Israel is suffering because of its sin. The occurrences of the word, the *only* occurrences in prechristian Jewish literature, are as follows: In II Macc. 5:20, Paul found the noun itself applied to the restoration of the temple through the heroism of those who gave their lives for the cause of God, the restoration celebrated in the Feast of Dedication:

> Howbeit the Lord did not choose the nation for the place's sake, but the place for the nation's sake. Wherefore also the place itself, having partaken in the calamities which befell the nation, did afterwards share in its benefits; and the place which was forsaken in the "wrath" of the Almighty, was at the Reconciliation (καταλλαγή) of the great Sovereign restored again with all glory.

Previously in the same book, written to promote the celebration of this same feast of the martyrs, the author had employed the verb, praying in 1:5 for the readers:

> that God will make peace, and hearken to your supplications, and be reconciled with you (καταλλαγείη), and not forsake you in an evil time.

Subsequently, in II Macc. 7:32ff., the writer puts into the mouth of the youngest of the seven martyred

sons of the widow the following words addressed to the persecuting tyrant. He speaks on behalf of Israel:

> For we are suffering because of our own sins; and if for rebuke and chastening our living Lord hath been "angered" a little while, yet shall he again be reconciled with (καταλλαγήσεται) his own servants. . . . For these our brethren, having endured a brief pain that bringeth everlasting life, have now died under God's covenant (or, "having endured a brief pain, have now drunk of everflowing life under God's covenant"). . . . And I, as my brethren, give up both body and soul for the laws of our fathers, calling upon God that he may speedily become gracious (ἵλεων γενέσθαι) to the nation; and that thou amidst trials and plagues mayest confess that he alone is God; and that in me and my brethren thou mayest stay the "wrath" of the Almighty.

Finally, in 8:29, the author tells how after the victory over Nicanor and distribution of the spoil to the wounded, widows and orphans,

> They made a common supplication and besought the merciful Lord to be wholly reconciled (καταλλαγῆναι) with his servants.

Apart from the fact that the great Servant "when he suffered threatened not" (I Pt. 2:23), the words of the young martyr of the story present almost the pattern of Jesus' dedication of his "body and blood," calling upon God that he may speedily become gracious to the nation. The use of the term Reconciliation in later Jewish literature supplements the Isaian, very much as the story of the cross supple-

ments that of the Galilean ministry in the Gospels. Its recurrence in a number of the Talmudic passages already cited will not have escaped the reader's attention. [3]

In Fourth Maccabees we have another book of the same martyrological literature. Paul appears to derive from it more than one conception, among the rest that of the temptation of Eve in II Cor. 11:3. The martyr in this Alexandrian work is the aged Eleazer (Lazarus), who is made the hero of the resurrection faith, together with the seven brethren. Once more it is brought out that the self-dedication is a free-will offering. Eleazer prays (6:27):

> Thou knowest, O God, that when I could have escaped I gave myself to death in fiery torments for the sake of the Law. Become propitious (ἵλεως γένου) to thy people. Let the punishment which we are enduring on their behalf suffice thee. Make my blood a purification (καθάρσιον) for them, and take my life as a life devoted (ἀντίψυχον) for theirs.

At the end of the book the author proposes the following as an epitaph for the heroes, who, he declares on the basis of Dt. 33:3, "are already standing beside the throne of God and living the endless life of felicity":

> On their account our enemies failed to conquer the nation. The tyrant was punished and the fatherland was purified, so that the devotion of their lives sufficed for the

[3] See above, pp. 363ff. Various forms of the verb *ratsah* are employed, chiefly in *piel* and *hithpael*. See also Ecclus. 16:11.

sin of the nation (*ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας*). And through the blood of those God-fearing men and the propitiation (*ἱλαστηρίου*) of their death divine Providence, which before had afflicted, now brought salvation to Israel.

The term "the Reconciliation" is no more difficult to understand in connection with the literature of Hebrew martyrology than the terms which habitually accompany it of "propitiation" and "wrath of God." We may object to the doctrine, but we cannot escape the meaning. Paul holds that the Isaian Servant must be understood as not merely *anointed* to proclaim glad tidings, but also as *suffering* to bring about the Reconciliation. He believes that the history of Jewish martyrdom had something to add to the Isaian doctrine. He also declares in no uncertain terms that Jesus did in fact make this self-dedication "for the sin of the nation," and that the love of God which was in Christ Jesus was thus brought to its perfect manifestation. The obscuration of this culminating fact in the story of Jesus, that he "gave himself for our sins," is intolerable to Paul. It destroys, to his mind, a vital element of the gospel.

To make the connection entirely clear between the primitive Christian doctrine of the Atonement and these prechristian passages from Jewish martyrology, we should not fail to adduce one more occur-

rence of the term Reconciliation, or Atonement. We take it from the Epistle in which Paul sets forth his "gospel" systematically, in order to forestall opposition. The great chapter on Justification by faith (Rom. 5) concludes the first part of the Epistle. The exposition had begun with a declaration of "the wrath of God," a condition under which both Jew and Gentile are found without escape, save as they are "justified freely by God's grace through the 'redemption' that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth in his blood as a token of 'propitiation' (ἱλαστήριον) through faith" (3:24f.). At the close of chapter 4 on the faith of Abraham, Paul returns to this "propitiation." Jesus, he says, borrowing the language and metaphors of Is. 53:6, 12, perhaps also of 54:4 (cf. Mt. 8:17 and Rom. 5:6), was "delivered up" for our trespasses, and was raised (to plead) for our justification. For while we were still "sick men" (cf. Is. 53:4), in due season Christ died for the ungodly. God commends his own love toward men even in their condition of sin by this "delivering up" of his Servant. For Isaiah says "The Lord delivered him up for our sins" (Κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν). But if Christ died for us while we were yet sinners, much more, being now forgiven (or "justified") in consideration of his blood (ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ), shall we be saved from the wrath through him.

For if, while we were enemies (Is. 53:12), we were restored to God's favor (κατηλλάγημεν) through the death of his Son, much more after having been restored (καταλλαγέντες) shall we be saved by his life (as our Intercessor in heaven). And we also have our assurance in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, for through him we have now received the Reconciliation (τὴν καταλλαγήν).

In view of what we have found to be the historical employments and connections of the term Atonement ("Reconciliation"=καταλλαγή), especially in view of the close relation to the Isaian chapter on the martyrdom of the Servant, who in Sap. 2:18 becomes explicitly God's "son" (υἱός), this thrice-repeated reference to the Reconciliation is decisive. It becomes impossible to mistake either Paul's meaning or its scriptural basis. His doctrine is unequivocally "objective." Dr. Denney's historical argument is sound when he declares (*The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, 1917, p. 30):

All sacrifice was sacrifice offered *to God*, and, whatever its value, it had value *for Him*. No man ever thought of offering sacrifice for the sake of a moral effect it was to produce on himself. If we say that the death of Christ was an atoning sacrifice, then the atonement must be an objective atonement. It is to God it is offered, and it is to God it makes a difference. Whatever objections may present themselves to it on reflection, this point of view was universal in the ancient Church.

Whether we approve, or disapprove, Paul's theology (and this is a question still held in reserve), Dr.

Denney is also correct in his insistence on discrimination between exegesis and theology, and the prior right of historical interpretation (p. 130):

> In the New Testament presentation of the Gospel the final cause of Christ's death—what God does in it—completely overshadows the antecedent or historical causes by which it was produced, and here it is the New Testament point of view which must determine our course. At the same time, while we recognize that the historical in the New Testament is eternal and divine, we must not allow ourselves to suppose that when we have apprehended the eternal and divine we can become indifferent to the historical and let it go. The whole power of Christianity is in its historical character, and to replace its sublime and tragic facts by a system of ideas, however true and imposing, is to destroy it altogether.

The distinction is closely allied to that we have sought to make between Paul's theology and his "gospel." In Romans he is avowedly presenting his theology, with explicit reference to those who accused him of preaching a doctrine of antinomian laxity (Rom. 3:8). He aims to show why the "word of the cross," the common gospel which he received from the beginning "how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," does not "give occasion to the flesh" or "make Christ a minister of sin." We have seen already that there is no more room for uncertainty as to the specific reference in Paul's mind when he declares that Christ "gave himself" for our sins than for the Scripture on which he based his faith that this was the predetermined purpose of

God. The reference is to the utterance at the farewell Supper, the same which he reiterates and emphasizes in rebuking the tendency at Corinth to observe the rite without "discrimination of the body." The whole point of the rebuke lies in the declaration that as a historical fact, received "from (ἀπό) the Lord" and faithfully transmitted, Jesus had said, in distributing the bread and wine, "This is my body, this is my blood, which is for you." To take away this self-dedication of Jesus in martyrdom to win God's favor to his people is to remove the keystone of Paul's gospel. He has nothing else whereby to demonstrate that "love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Apart from this he cannot point to a single word or act of Jesus which would justify his declaration "He loved me and gave himself up for me."

It is true that Paul individualizes, as Jesus did not; and this undoubtedly makes a difference in our historical interpretation of Jesus' word and act. But the historic fact is one thing, the application another. There is no pretense on Paul's part that his application of the love of Christ to individual sinners of every race was that intended by Jesus. On the contrary, he is perfectly clear and explicit in declaring this to be his own personal, later revelation. The denationalization of the gospel was the very essence of his own revelation of that "mystery of the gospel,

which in other generations had not been made known unto the sons of men" (Eph. 3:3-6). But as regards the historical fact that Jesus did make this self-dedication substantially as reported by Paul in I Cor. 11:23-25, there is no reasonable room for doubt. Efforts to eliminate this factor as a later interpolation from the best attested of all the letters of Paul are as destitute of logic as they are of textual support; and even if successful, they would leave a mass of other evidence to the same effect. We should still be obliged to explain what Paul meant by his affirmations elsewhere that Christ "gave himself up," that he, Paul, received from the outset the doctrine that "Christ died for our sins," and the like.

Yet the very battle Paul wages against the obscuration of this primitive gospel, his rebuke of a mode of observance of the Supper which failed to "discriminate the body," the necessity laid upon him of defending "the word of the cross" against misrepresentation and calumny, prove abundantly that Paul's witness was objected to. Others who claimed a more direct relation with Jesus denied the legitimacy of Paul's inferences. There were forms of presentation of the message in which "the stumbling-block of the cross" was avoided. And in spite of Paul's imputation of unworthy motive, in Gal. 6:12, it is not probable that escape from persecution for the cross of Christ was the *only* motive

with all who opposed Paul's view. We have seen that the Lukan writings embody sources quite at the opposite pole from Paul, that in particular they present a doctrine of salvation in which the vicarious suffering of Jesus plays no part whatever, and even a story of the Supper completely destitute of the idea that Jesus "gave himself up for the forgiveness of sin." We cannot do full justice to the Apostolic Message unless we also learn what we can of this non-Pauline, not to say this anti-Pauline, point of view.

Since the period of the Book of Daniel and the Maccabean struggle, martyrology had begun to take a place in the religious thought of Judaism, supplementing the Isaian doctrine of the suffering Servant with that of self-dedication "for the sanctification of the Name." Before we consider its objectionable features, which, as already noted, were opposed by the strong trend of the Synagogue toward individual moral accountability, it will be only fair to take note of its general spirit, and in particular of that element which retained a permanent footing even down to modern times in spite of all opposition, the belief in "grace" for the nation (Zechuth) obtained by those who gave their "witness" for Jehovah by voluntary suffering for His Law and the triumph of His Sovereignty. If martyrology is to have a part in our religious convictions, we must fully understand

its nature, not repeating the error of James and John, who think the spirit of Jesus can be vindictive (Lk. 9:54f.).

An early example of the spirit of Hebrew martyrdom will be found in the addition made by the Greek translators to the story of the three martyrs in Dan. 3:1-23. In the English Apocrypha it is called The Song of the Three Holy Children, an infelicitous substitute for the Greek Προσευχὴ Ἀζαρίου καὶ τῶν τριῶν παίδων αἴνεσις, that is, The Prayer of Azarias and Hymn of the Three Servants (Martyrs). Cast into the midst of Nebuchadnezzar's burning fiery furnace for their bold confession of their national faith, Azarias, leader of the three, lifts up his voice "in the midst of the fire" to acknowledge the justice of God's judgment under which Israel is suffering:

> In all the things that thou hast brought upon us, and upon the holy city of our fathers, Jerusalem, thou hast executed true judgments; for according to truth and justice hast thou brought all these things upon us because of our sins. For we have sinned and committed iniquity in departing from thee.

After full enumeration of the national wrong-doing, and the disasters to which it had led in the overthrow of city and temple and cessation of the prescribed worship, Azarias offers a petition which reminds us of the theme of Hebrews, a humble entreaty that the sacrifice of these human lives, willingly laid down as a testimony of devotion, may be accepted as a

substitute for the prescribed offering of the blood of bulls and goats. By this offering the three martyrs hope to obtain again that favor which the nation had justly forfeited:

> Deliver us not up utterly, for thy Name's sake, neither disannul thy Covenant, and cause not thy mercy to depart from us, for the sake of Abraham that is beloved of thee, and for the sake of Isaac, thy servant, and Israel, thy dedicated one[4] for to these thou didst promise that thou wouldest multiply their seed as the stars of heaven. For we, O Lord, are become less than any nation, and are kept under in all the world this day because of our sins. Neither is there at this time prince or prophet or leader, or burnt-offering or sacrifice or oblation or incense, or place to offer before thee and find mercy.

Specifically the petition is then made that "a contrite heart and a humble spirit" may be accepted in lieu of ritual sacrifice (Ps. 51:17):

> Let us, nevertheless, be accepted in a contrite heart and a humble spirit, like as in the burnt offerings of rams and bullocks, and like as in ten thousands of fat lambs; so let our sacrifice be this day in thy sight, and grant that we (Israel) may wholly go after thee, for they shall not be ashamed that put their trust in thee.

In Israel's name, for whom the martyr desires to speak, and whose spirit of renewed devotion he wishes to reflect, the supplicant thus closes his petition:

> And now we follow thee with all our heart, we fear thee, and seek thy face. Put us not to shame: but deal with

[4] In allusion to Gen. 28:18 ff.; 35:9 ff.

us after thy kindness, and according to the multiude of thy mercy. Deliver us also according to thy marvelous works, and give glory to thy Name, O Lord.

The opportunity of "witness" for Jehovah in martyrdom is welcomed because it gives occasion to prove "wholeness of heart" on the part of Israel. So far as the individual martyr is concerned, it supplies, of course, "the last full measure of devotion." But in making himself a devotee, the martyr is fully conscious that only as his individual spirit of contrition and humility is really representative of his fellow-countrymen's can his prayer be answered. Israel *as a nation* must be "whole-hearted" in its devotion, else it cannot be received again as Jehovah's Servant. We have taken the example just given from a period of approximately a century before Christ; we may take another, especially illustrative of this feature of whole-heartedness in Hebrew martyrology, from the story of the martyrdom of Akiba, the shepherd-rabbi, who became the victim of Roman torture almost exactly a hundred years after Calvary, in consequence of his participation in the revolt of Bar-Cochba.

The story is told by way of illustrating the meaning of the Jewish vow of loyalty to Jehovah, called the Shema. To "take upon oneself the yoke of the divine sovereignty" by reciting the words: "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is *one*, and thou shalt

love Jehovah thy God with *all* thy mind, and *all* thy strength, and with *all* thy soul" (or "life"), is to make a vow of unreserved devotion. Anything less reveals that "double mind" despised by all teachers of Jewish and Jewish-Christian ethics. The story tells how Akiba was led to the stake at the hour of prayer, when the Shema was recited, and uttered it joyfully as he went. When asked how he could thus perish with a smile on his lips, he answered (referring to his life of toil, first under the hardships of peasant life, afterward in the devoted study and teaching of the Law): "Thus far it has been given me to love Jehovah with my strength, and with my mind. Why should I not rejoice now that it is given me to love him with my soul (or 'life')?" Such is the whole-hearted "love" without which Paul declares that even the giving of one's body to be burned "profiteth nothing."

If, with that larger vision which is said to be given in the supreme hour to such as perish for their faith, Akiba could have looked back a hundred years, he would have seen one of humble origin like his own giving the supreme pattern of whole-hearted loyalty to Jehovah and his sovereignty. For the last utterance of Jesus also to those who delivered him up to death was a "taking on himself of the yoke of the divine sovereignty." Just before the end, Jesus too was asked to sum up his religion. In the Shema,

the Credo of every Jewish martyr in all the generations since, he gave his own New Commandment: "Thou shalt *love* with *all* thy heart."

The story of the Supper bears this out. We shall not do justice to the spirit in which Jesus went to the cross if we fail to recognize in this act of self-dedication the noblest element of all in the spirit of Hebrew martyrdom: Jesus welcomed the cross as an *opportunity*. If we accept the testimony of Paul, we can only understand the act as one not of passive acquiescence, not of mere resignation, but of victorious faith. The parable of the bread and the cup means that Jesus was not merely submissive to a fate he would not flee, but that he made the cup of suffering, as the great martyrs of his people had done before and have done since, a witness to his whole-hearted devotion for the sanctification of Jehovah's name, for the triumph of his sovereignty, and for the restoration of divine favor to a people prepared for the Coming of their King.

Looked at in this nobler aspect, the teachings of martyrology have something to contribute to religion. The love of country expressed in the sacrifice of those who have died for freedom, and for the fulfilment of the national ideal, has made it possible and natural in all ages that blood-stained banners and battle-flags should be draped beside our altars. As these words are written (November 11,

1924), the church-bells are tolling for the martyrs of the Great War. The religious instinct of the people sees nothing incongruous in this, because the national ideal is identified with the divine. The spirit which animated the noblest of the heroic dead is ascribed to all. They freely gave their lives that humanity might inherit a better world. In the case of Judaism, this ideal of a Kingdom of God, a divine sovereignty in which Jehovah's Name should be sanctified, his will be honored by every heart, was more definite and clear than in any religion of which we know. The nation of martyrs is the nation which in its sublimation of patriotism has come nearest to the ideal of Christianity. Had Jesus fallen below this level of Jewish patriotism in the acceptance of his martyr fate, had he not welcomed it as his opportunity to testify his own devotion to this calling of God, and the devotion of all whom he could claim to represent, we should have felt that something was lacking to his true humanity. Therefore we accept gladly the witness of Paul as to the fact of the self-dedication. It is not an act apart, isolated from the rest of the ministry. It was the completion of Jesus' service to his country. It was the unifying capstone of his career. For, from the beginning, what he had sought was the Reconciliation. To restore the relation of Israel to Jehovah in perfect loyalty, for the achievement of Jehovah's right-

eous and loving purpose for the world—this, and this alone, had been the motive of all Jesus' teaching, all his work of beneficence. To sum up all this work, now that the cross loomed just before, by the dedication to the Father of his body and blood was not incongruous with his earlier ministry. His action breathes the spirit of the prayer, "Father, thy Name be sanctified, thy Kingdom come." It fulfils the New Commandment: "Thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is a supreme manifestation of that "love" without which even to give one's body to be burned "profiteth nothing." Because of its consistency with Jesus' ministry and teaching as a whole, we accept the act as historical. And we accept it not merely as an admissible fact, but as the supremely interpretative fact of Jesus' whole career. To us, as to Paul, it stands out as "the word of the cross," the great parable in which Jesus himself chose to sum up his message of redemptive love to the world.

But there are other aspects of martyrology which have justly awakened alarm and reaction on the part of those who stand for individual moral accountability. Its spirit both in Jewish and Christian sources has too often been anything rather than a spirit of love. In *Enoch* xlvii. 1-4 Israel's deliverance is thus

promised in answer to the intercession of angels, who offer the prayers and blood of the martyrs:

> In that day shall the prayer of the righteous and the blood of the righteous ascend up before the Lord of Spirits. In those days shall the holy ones, who dwell above in the heavens, intercede with one voice. They shall pray, praise, give thanks, and glorify the name of the Lord of Spirits, because of the blood of the righteous, and because of the prayer of the righteous, that it may not be in vain in the sight of the Lord of Spirits, that judgment may be done unto them, and that they may not have to suffer forever. In those days I saw how the Ancient of Days sat upon the throne of his glory (the judgment throne), and the books of the living were opened before him, and his whole host, which is in heaven above and around him, stood before him. The hearts of the holy ones were filled with joy because the number of righteousness (the foreordained number of the elect) was near (completion), the prayer of the righteous answered, and the blood of the righteous avenged before the Lord of Spirits.

Even in the parable of the Importunate Widow (Lk. 18:1-8) it is not easy to draw the line between the vindicative and the vindictive. The object of the parable is to explain why the judgment is deferred. If the Son of Man came at once, he would not find faith on the earth. We cannot say that Jesus here endorses the vindictive spirit of the Enoch passage just quoted. But at least he shows sympathy with Israel's cry for vindication in the utterance: "And shall not God avenge his own elect that cry to him day and night? I say unto you that he will avenge them speedily." We cannot condemn Jewish apocalypse on this score

and absolve the Christian so long as we retain the scene of the Christian Apocalypse wherein the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus cries out to God for vengeance (Rev. 19:2; 20:4-6). The Christian seer also beholds beneath the heavenly altar "the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God and the testimony which they kept" (6:9f.),

> And they cried with a great voice saying, How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?

Later, after these have been joined by their brethren "killed even as they were," John sees (20:4-6)

> thrones and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God. . . . And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished. These shall be priests of God and of Christ.[5]

The cry of the martyrs for vengeance on them that dwell on the earth is no more Christian in the Revelation of John than in *Enoch.* It represents a factor of

[5] The conception of priesthood is not limited in the New Testament, as is often said, to the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is elaborated there, but the conception is primitive. Because as martyr, Jesus is taken up to God in an immediate resurrection to intercede for his brethren, he becomes their great high priest. But in the *Apocalypse of Peter* the same characterization is applied to the "justified ones" who are seen in Paradise in the vision granted to the Twelve. Jesus explains to them as they look at the glorified men who had been "taken up," "These are your high priests" (ἀρχιερεῖς ὑμῶν). In the present passage from Rev. 20:6 the same conception is expressed. We have found the beginnings of it in the Prayer of Azarias.

this type of religious belief not easy to reconcile with the spirit of him who, when he suffered, threatened not, whose blood, as the author of the great Epistle of Priesthood and martyrdom well says, "speaketh better things than that of Abel" crying from the ground for vengeance. Nor does this feeling of incongruity lack expression in the Gospels themselves. Luke inserts in the crucifixion scene the prayer: "Father, forgive them," and repeats the teaching in the scene of the martyrdom of Stephen. It is repeated again in Hegesippus' account of the martyrdom of James. If Mark rejects the idea of places of special honor in heaven for the martyred sons of Zebedee, Lk. 9:54f. goes still further in rebuke of their spirit. The sons of thunder would call down fire from heaven on their enemies. Jesus will have nothing of this. It represents a mind that is foreign to his own.

Nor was the spirit of vindictiveness all that required to be cast out. We know from Paul's own statements what opposition his doctrine of "blood-atonement" encountered. Contemporary Jewish sources, such as Josephus and II Esdras, show that even intercession and mediation were rejected by the stricter Jewish moralists, as tending to undermine the sense of individual accountability. Intercession would play no part in the final Judgment, however it might be represented in Scripture as availing with

God to avert earthly calamity. Whether this extreme form of moralistic reaction was due to specifically Christian teaching, or merely to the general tendency, we cannot say. The fact itself is apparent, and over against it the tendency of popular belief to make of the principle of Zechuth a shield against personal condemnation is amply attested in Talmudic teaching.

Mediation by saints and martyrs became notoriously a superstition tending to demoralization in the Church from a very early period. In the "Letter of the Smyrnæans" of the Martyrdom of Polycarp, written shortly after 154 A.D. we learn of the refusal of the magistrates to give up the body of the martyr lest the Christians "should give up the Crucified One and begin to worship this man," a calumny of course resented by the writer of the Letter, but indicative of the beginnings of a cult such as the writer himself describes:

> So we (after the attempt to destroy the body of Polycarp by burning) took up his bones, which are more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold, and laid them in a suitable place; where the Lord will permit us to gather together, as we are able, in gladness and joy, and to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom (that is, of his entrance into immortality), for the commemoration of those that have already fought in the contest, and for the training and preparation of those that shall do so hereafter.

The services held in commemoration of the martyrdom of Polycarp are not open to objection, but

the Church remained by no means free from the cult of saints and martyrs, making them mediators with God because of the belief in their special and immediate resurrection. We find the superstitious expectation that, because of their martyrdom, the prayers of martyrs would have special weight in securing divine mercy. There was even a vast commerce in the relics of real or supposititious confessors of the faith founded upon this belief, but tending only to degrade the teaching of the gospel. It may be that contemporary Jewish teaching was quite unconnected with this. The phenomena in Church and Synagogue may be wholly independent. But even so, they illustrate only the more clearly the perils of a morbid factor in religion. Dr. Oesterley, in his *Jewish Doctrine of Mediation* (1910), shows clearly what manner of beliefs the Synagogue felt obliged to counteract:

> In *Sifre* 73b it is said that a man should rejoice more in chastisement than in prosperity, because if he enjoyed good fortune all the days of his life, the sins of which he is guilty would not be forgiven him. How, it is asked, can he obtain forgiveness? he is forgiven by means of chastisements. The matter is put very baldly in *Pesikta* 161b, where it is said that God causes the righteous to pay him what they owe him on account of the evil deeds which they have done. In *Bereshith Rabba,* c. 65, we are told that Isaac prayed that he might be granted sufferings in order to turn away from him the judgment in the world to come. Again, "Suffering is more apt than sacrifice to win God's favor and to atone for man" (*Bereshith Rabba,* 5a). If suffering thus

makes atonement for sin, much more will this be the case with death. Therefore it is taught that for all those who seek to attain to righteousness death in itself effects reconciliation. "Let my death make atonement for all my sins" men say when they are dying or in great peril. "All who die are reconciled through death" is a saying quoted in *Sifre* 33a. And the more dreadful the death, the more efficacious is its reconciling power; therefore martyrdom is a supreme means of reconciliation. That martrys should be believed to have places of special honor in heaven stands to reason (*Baba Bathra* 10b).

One cannot fail to recognize here the phraseology of the New Testament, however mutually unaffected Church and Synagogue remained once the separation had been effected. The explanation lies, of course, in the common background of religious ideas. Even the doctrine of places of special honor in heaven for martyrs has to be combatted in Mk. 10:35-40, precisely as would be the case were this a Jewish writing. Moreover, it is self-evident that Paul's special application of the utterance of Jesus at the farewell Supper, making it an expression of self-devotion not for Israel, not even for the new Israel of God, "the Church," but for individual sinners, and thus for the whole world, abolishes the only defense rabbinic theology was able to set up against abuse of the doctrine of Zechuth. As Bousset and Burton have reminded us, individual sinners were debarred from pleading the merits of the fathers, or the righteous deeds of saints and martyrs, in their own behalf, on

the ground that this merit was available only to the community. It is a dialectical way of expressing the truth which we have endeavored to set forth in more intelligible form by asking the reader to place himself in imagination at the *nationalistic* point of view of the typical Jewish hero and martyr. The sacrifice made by them was indeed an expression of their love and devotion to the *nation* as Jehovah's servant. It was indeed "for the forgiveness of sins," an explanatory gloss which Mt. 26:28 attaches to the clause of Mk. 14:24, much as in the Lord's Prayer the explanatory clauses are attached to the simpler form of Lk. 11:2 "He that is in heaven," "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven," and with equally good ground, provided we do not interpret in an individual sense. Jesus did dedicate his body and blood "for the many," as had been said of Moses. This was, as in the case of Moses, "for the forgiveness of sins." But grounds for supposing that Jesus meant this in an individualistic sense are wholly lacking, and the analogy both of his own moral teaching and of contemporary Jewish morality is decidedly opposed to such an understanding.

When, therefore, Paul insists on removing this distinction, when he avowedly denationalizes the gospel message, making the Reconciliation no longer that of Israel, but of "the world," when he makes the ex-

pression of Jesus' self-sacrificing love apply directly to the individual sinner, so that every wayward son of Adam may use the words: "He loved me, and gave himself up for me," we cannot consider that Paul means this as historical interpretation. It is a theological, or, as we might perhaps better say, a pragmatic application, justified, at least to Paul's mind, by his special "revelation of the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men, how that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus." In Paul's mind the doctrine of Justification by Faith apart from works of Law was sufficiently guarded from abuse by its companion doctrine of Life in the Spirit. God could be "just" (meet all requirements of real righteousness) even while freely forgiving the unjust, if these "unjust" had "faith" (were genuine devotees of Christ). Paul's more conservative fellow-Christians allowed the principle of "grace" for Christ's sake, but were apprehensive of Paul's doctrine of the cross. The history of martyrology shows that they had reason to be. Men undoubtedly are prone to think of mere suffering endured for God's sake as imposing an obligation on him, or as though a sense of "mere physical pity" at the sight of "bleeding wounds" might override his better judg-

ment. The evils and dangers of martyrology should be considered, as well as its appeal, when we raise the question of its validity.

This ultimate question of validity we have still to consider. Paul applied the principle of the "love of Christ" in a more individual—a more universalistic sense than it originally implied. Was this wider application justified? Can we continue to say individually, after Paul's example, of this self-dedication of Jesus: "He loved *me*, and gave himself for *me?*" That will depend largely on our acceptance or rejection of Paul's theological method. Is it, or is it not legitimate to treat the self-dedication of Jesus as a manifestation of the love of God "in" Christ? But we have at least attained a preliminary conclusion. It is not necessary to infer from the silence of the Jewish-Christian sources represented in Luke and James that Jesus did not utter the words ascribed to him by Paul. The silence of these later representatives of Jerusalem tradition cannot outweigh the affirmative testimony of the older sources. It has its explanation in the fear of misinterpretation. Just as James explicitly repudiates the Pauline principle that a man may be "justified by faith apart from works," so the Lukan writings avoid all expressions which might give color to the abuse so continually made by "a crude evangelism" of the doctrine of "blood atonement." Paul does not indeed teach a

doctrine of "substitutionary atonement." We have given exegetical reason for opposing this view as mistaken. But the need of caution against misuse is quite apparent from the fact that his teaching has been so interpreted. Mark himself is first to help on misuse by his employment of the phrase "to give his life *instead of* many." It is this caution against misuse which explains Luke's silence. The Jewish-Christian sources hold to the *intercession* of Christ for all who by repentance and baptism have placed themselves under his protection. In this they are clearly marked off from the contemporary teaching of the Synagogue, which either disallows intercession entirely, or at least disallows that of Jesus. But the Jewish-Christian writers do not hold that the martyr fate which Jesus underwent has any further significance than a fulfilment of "the determinate foreknowledge and counsel of God." Salvation is obtained not *through* the cross, but in spite of it. In this they are no less clearly differentiated from the teaching of Paul.

CHAPTER XII.

THE MESSAGE IN MODERN TERMS

IN the foregoing inquiry the testimony of Paul has been made the basis because most ancient and best authenticated, but with distinction of Paul's "gospel" from the "theology" by which he adapts it to the special circumstances or opposition he is obliged to meet. The testimony which requires to be compared with Paul's comes to us from two groups of sources, those associated with the name of Peter, principally represented in Synoptic story, and those associated with the name of James. Neither of these two types of teaching are accessible in primitive form; but by availing ourselves of all sources of information, a reasonably definite and reliable conception can be formed of what we may designate respectively the Petrine and the Jacobean interpretations of the Apostolic Message.

We may sum up the witness of Peter under the two exhortations to Faith and Love. The ministry of Jesus in Galilee is related to inculcate Faith. Mk. 1:14f. summarizes Jesus' preaching when "after John was delivered up" he came into Galilee and began his work, in the words "preaching the gospel of God

and saying: The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe in the gospel." This may very well represent an expansion by the evangelist himself of the simpler form found in Mt. 4:17 "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." [1] If so, Mark is extremely well advised in his expansion. The addition "Have faith in the glad tidings" represents precisely the distinction by which the preaching of Jesus surpasses the warning of the Baptist. The "faith" which he inculcates is to be judged by the ancient prayer to which he adverts in his reply to Sadducees, who have abandoned the national hope of a divine intervention. Like that of the *Shemoneh Esreh,* the "faith" of Jesus is faith in a "living" God, whose redemptive power is already invisibly at work to restore the national life.

Thou art mighty forever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; Who sustainest the living with beneficence, quickenest the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty those who are bound, and upholding thy faithfulness to those that sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord, the Almighty; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, Who killest and makest alive again, and causest help to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead.[2]

[1] On the other hand, assimilation is characteristic of Matthean redaction. With Mt. 4:17 compare 3:2.

[2] Second Blessing of the *Shemoneh Esreh.* Blessing I proclaims Jehovah Redeemer of Israel because of his promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The two together are employed in Mk. 12:24.

The anecdotes of the Galilean ministry collected in the first half of Mark have as their intrinsic motive the teaching and exemplification of just such faith in God as a living Redeemer. He upholds his faithfulness to his promise to the forefathers, even though his people may seem now, as it were, bound among the dead.[3] It is true that our Roman Gospel reduces this spiritual interpretation of the Isaian promise toward the level of mere popular thaumaturgy. In the interest of his apologetic, Mark seeks to depict Jesus as the great Exorciser and Wonder-worker. But we have seen that Paul and the Second Source enable us to restore the original sense. Jesus teaches and exemplifies *faith in God.*

And in the story of self-dedication to the cross, which occupies the second half of Mark, the motive is just as manifestly Love. Like the word "faith," the word "love" must be interpreted by contemporary use. We must understand it in the light of the ancient symbol of loyalty which Jesus cites to the scribe who asks him to sum up the Law, as well as in the light of the New Commandment which he joins with the symbol:

> Hear, O Israel. The Lord our God, the Lord is One; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God in the oneness of thy heart, and in the oneness of thy soul, and in the oneness

[3] Compare with this expression of faith in "the power of God" to redeem, Paul's similar expression in Eph. 1:19-2:7.

of thy mind, and in the oneness of thy strength. Thou shalt also love thy neighbor as thyself.

The self-dedication to cross or flames which the Jewish martyr expresses in the Shema is something very different from the vague sentiment which the modern Christian is apt to attach to the phrase "love toward God." Perhaps love toward our brother men has also some need to be restored to the significance which it bore to Jesus. But we limit ourselves to "the first and great commandment." An apprehension of the terms "faith" and "love" in their actual, historical sense, the meaning we are forced to give them when we place ourselves in the national environment in which they were uttered, is not without a certain value. When we thus read the group of anecdotes which center upon the self-dedication of the parting Supper and the cross, collected in the second part of Mark's record of the preaching of Peter, we cannot be in doubt as to this form of the Message. The witness of Peter was a report of the sayings and doings of the Lord, not including all, but aiming to teach by the word and example of Jesus the lesson of Faith in God the Redeemer, and the lesson of sacrificial Love.

In comparison with the Epistles of Paul, the Synoptic record as transmitted represents a late and mingled stream. Nevertheless, with help from Paul himself, it is not difficult to trace to the witness of Peter, by

derivation both direct and indirect, all essential elements of that gospel of Justification by Faith apart from works of Law which Paul lays down as the basis of the common Apostolic Message. Peter's experience after Calvary was the pattern in all respects, save for its limitation to "the circumcision," for Paul's own. It needed only to be universalized to make it a world-wide "hope of justification" by "faith working through love" (Gal. 5:5f.).

But Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith cannot stand alone. It demands as its inseparable complement his doctrine of Life in the Spirit, and for this, too, we find precedent in the Synoptic record, less decisive than in the case of the Petrine gospel, and disconnected with any apostolic name unless it be that of James the brother of Jesus. The so-called Second, or Teaching, Source represents a type of doctrine similar to that of the Epistle of James, and affords our best access to the real mind of Christ as respects the Redemption to which he looked forward. Without this Source we should know neither the Sermon on the Mount nor the Lord's Prayer; nor can it be denied that these teachings show deep affinity with the basic lessons of Faith and Love which we have found to underlie the Gospel of Mark.

Paul's doctrine of Life in the Spirit rests primarily, we willingly grant, on his own inward experience corroborated by that of his fellow-believers. But

Paul had predecessors in this, and the theological inferences which he draws from this experience were no novel construction peculiar to himself. Experiences of the "Gift of the Spirit" were the most universal of any known to the Christian brotherhood. To all, these were "the gift of Christ." The fact that they had received them was accepted as proof that he had been raised to the right hand of God. They made it the ground of their hope of redemption and their recognition as a new people of the divine election. Paul does not differ from other primitive Christians in regarding baptism and its accompanying phenomena of the Charismata as belonging to the very essence of Christianity. He differs only in the moral emphasis which he places upon the phenomena, and in his identification of "the Spirit" with the "mind of Christ." It is here that the Second Source comes to our aid with its evidence correcting the Markan report of Petrine tradition. The doctrine of Faith which Jesus preached was not belief in his own authority or omnipotence. It was not an appeal to thaumaturgy and exorcism, but faith in the redeeming "power of God," a power manifested according to the promise of Isaiah, which the prayer of the *Shemoneh Esreh* applies in similar language, a faith in him who is "mighty to save, quickening his dead people with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, setting at liberty those who were

bound, and upholding his faithfulness even to those that sleep in the dust."

The Second Source not only thus corrects the Markan doctrine of Faith, but it applies Jesus' doctrine of the redemptive Power of God *to his own personality* as well as to that of all believers. Jesus had taught that the new moral life to which the people were awakened by his preaching, as well as the physical healings, were due to "the Spirit of God." The Christology of the Vision and Voice from Heaven in the introductory story of the Baptism and Divine Call, which has been made by Mark fundamental to the entire Synoptic record, is nothing more nor less than an application of this doctrine of Jesus to his own case, and to that of all who are "conformed to his image." He himself, as God's agent in the Redemption, was "anointed with the Holy Spirit." It rested upon him in its plenitude. His career had thus begun. It made him the Son of God *par éminence*. The Redeemer sent by Jehovah in love to the posterity of the patriarchs was he of whom Isaiah had written "I will put my Spirit upon him."

The combination of this "wisdom" doctrine of the Second Source with the Servant doctrine of the primitive Petrine gospel is Hellenistic. Its antecedents appear in the Wisdom literature of prechristian Judaism and are also reflected in the Epistle of James. The form it assumes in the Pauline Epistles is an

unmistakable incarnation doctrine. Here it may quite possibly be affected, directly or indirectly, by Alexandrian speculation. The teachings of Apollos were certainly not unacceptable to Paul. But back of these more speculative applications lies a true word of Jesus. It is his own expression of faith in the present operation of the redeeming, saving Spirit of God as attendant upon his ministry. The reflection of this utterance of Jesus, making his work the work of God, appears in the primitive doctrine of his person. The "gifts of the Spirit" experienced by the first believers are not thought of as new endowments. They merely bear out and continue those which had characterized the ministry of the Lord. Hence we pass without conscious break from the Adoptionist Christology of Mark to the Incarnation doctrine of Paul. In introducing a doctrine of real preëxistence, instead of mere foreordination, Paul undoubtedly does mark a distinct advance in primitive Christology. But neither he nor his fellow-believers are conscious of radical change, because long since they had conceived the whole ministry as a work of "the Spirit of God," and this had been on authority of the word of Jesus himself.

The task we set for ourselves was primarily historical. To raise the question of the validity of Paul's interpretation of the story may seem already to transcend the limits of a "historical inquiry," unless we

restrict ourselves to setting forth the logic of Paul's inferences on the basis of the facts as they would present themselves to him. This limitation we have sought to observe. Indeed, if the question be transferred to the field of philosophy, if it be given the form: Can human love and sacrifice affect the relation of God to humanity? we must confess our incompetence. To answer it thus formulated, one must be able to define personality in God and man, and determine the limits of divine sovereignty and human free-agency. Our effort has been a humbler one. Assuming that personality rather than mechanism affords the truer analogy for man's relation to God, we have sought to show that the principle to which Paul appeals in his struggle to vindicate his gospel of "grace" is not obsolete. Its forms are indeed anthropomorphic. To a large extent they are already outgrown. We still retain in the language of hymnology references to

> wounds yet visible above
> In beauty glorified;

but it may well be questioned whether the figures retain a definite sense to those who employ them, and whether, if they do, that sense is a true and wholesome one. Nevertheless, anthropomorphism, though incessantly outgrown, is never superseded. While we retain the conceptions of personality, we shall retain it in greater or less degree. We are ready to

translate outworn terms into modern equivalents when it can be done without a remainder. But we are not ready to discard the anthropomorphisms of the past till we have found a full equivalent for such real truths as they formerly served to convey.

Divine "wrath" and "reconciliation" were figurative expressions already even in Paul's day. The historical interpreter, even if he do not aspire to the title of philosopher or theologian, will not think his task complete without some attempt to find equivalents for obsolete forms. But he cannot be satisfied with less than a *full* equivalent. As Bushnell perceived, the problem of the theologian on its historical side is largely a question of language. Are the "altar-terms" of Paul still applicable, or must they be translated into more modern equivalents in order to convey the corresponding thought?

Certainly it is undeniable that there has been a change in the most fundamental term of all. Our very conception of God himself has changed. It has gained immeasurably in fulness and richness both from science and philosophy. Ptolemaic ideas of God's relation to the universe are no longer possible. The belief that he becomes "angry" and needs to be "appeased" no longer exists in any literal sense. Our conception of his personality has been checked and corrected by our conviction of the universal reign of law. Perhaps the change has not all been gain.

In substituting the analogies of mechanism for the analogies of personal will, we may have lost more than we gained in apprehension of the real truth. At all events we have changed. Translation of the old terminology and figures of speech into modern equivalents is unavoidable. The alternative of translation is not return to the old, which has disappeared forever, but a supposed return, which in reality brings us to nothing better than a ghastly caricature, a monstrosity reconstructed by unskilful hands from the limbo of dead beliefs.

We have found the earliest and most authentic expression of the Apostolic message to have been that of ritual. Baptism and the Supper were the means employed when as yet there was no other official definition, before even oral gospel story had taken a stereotyped form, to convey to converts and to the world both the teaching of Jesus and the teaching about Jesus. Baptism is admittedly the later of the two. The Supper is "from the Lord." Baptism transmits the Message as the Apostles received and understood it. In its accompanying phenomena of "the Spirit" it represents their experience. The narratives which from their intrinsic character seem to have grown up about it relate to the "anointing" of Jesus with the Spirit, and the ministry of teaching and healing which ensued upon it. With scarcely

an exception, these narratives come down to us as reminiscences from the preaching of Peter.

Paul lays chief emphasis elsewhere. Baptism is not primary with him, but the Supper. This commemorates the event of supreme importance in Jesus' career and embodies a message from Jesus himself. It expresses "the love of Christ," which, by virtue of the fact that Christ was sent by the Father to accomplish his redemptive work, is nothing less than "the love of God which is *in* Christ Jesus our Lord." Baptism is the "seal" of the new covenant in the blood of Christ. The believer expresses in baptism his loyal faith. God (again acting *through* the risen Christ) imparts his Spirit as both pledge and power. The Spirit conveys power to live "not unto ourselves," and is the "earnest" of the "inheritance of sons." "Justification by faith apart from works of law" is the theological principle of Paul's gospel. He defends it by appeal to the Supper. Jesus "gave himself up on our behalf for the forgiveness of sins." "Sanctification by grace" is its indispensable complement and is inferred from the doctrine implied in baptism. The Spirit therewith imparted is a new life incompatible with sin and death. Life in the Spirit is the only life for all Christians. Good works are simply "fruits of the Spirit." Hence while baptism, or rather what baptism stands for, is indispensable,

it is rather to be regarded as the believer's response to the Message than as the Message itself. The Message sent forth by Jesus himself as herald of peace to the world from his Father is the message of the Reconciliation; peace to those that were far off as well as to those that were nigh, with access in one Spirit to the common Father. All "ministers of the new covenant" were commissioned to make known this manifestation of the love of God "in Christ" to a sinful world, and to declare that their sins are no longer reckoned to them. Such would be our summary of Paul's gospel. In theological terms, men have expressed it under two heads: (1) Justification in the blood of Christ; (2) Sanctification in the Spirit of Christ. Our final question then is: To what extent are these two theological principles valid to-day, and in what terms should their present significance be expressed?

No endorsement of transmitted doctrine, Pauline or other, can have value, which does not rest upon genetic study. When we have followed up the logical processes by which Paul arrived at his "gospel," we shall be qualified to pass a serviceable judgment upon his conclusions. The means of following up these logical processes are furnished in some degree by Paul, himself, and have led us to the following inferences:

(1) "Justification" means simply acquittal before

the heavenly tribunal. The simpler gospel which preceded Paul's, and to which he makes appeal, expressed this by saying: "He died for our sins, and makes intercession for our forgiveness at the throne of God." In all that goes beyond the simple utterance of Jesus in dedication of his body and blood, this was an inference from "the Scriptures." Jesus' act was interpreted in the light of Is. 53:5f., 11f. and Ps. 110:1. While Paul was still a persecutor, men were thus interpreting it. They were putting themselves under the protection of Jesus, confessing their "faith" in him while waiting for his appearance from heaven to deliver them from the coming "wrath." They expressed this by being baptized into his name. "Faith" was used in the sense of adhesion to Jesus, as converts to Judaism became adherents of Jehovah by taking on them the yoke of the divine sovereignty in the Shema, and such "faith" was the natural ground on which to expect this "grace."

(2) Sanctification is that "life in the Spirit" in expectation of which God forgives. Here again Paul advances upon the earlier common gospel, giving a moral application to Jesus' doctrine of the redemptive Spirit. Since the "faith" professed implies full, sincere, and unreserved dedication of the human will, nothing more can be required to insure achievement of the moral ideal save divine coöperation. This heavenly endowment is visibly conferred in the

"gifts of the Spirit" whereby God works in us to will and to do. The Spirit in believers is the same Spirit of God which worked in and with Jesus. Outward manifestations are of value, but the essential and abiding are inward and invisible. These are the qualities which constitute "the mind of Christ." In the "love" which in humble obedience suffered death on the cross, this Spirit of God which was in Christ reaches that full and clear expression which unifies the Redeemer's career. All his earlier work was tributary to this. By infusion with this spirit of the First-born, human effort working together with divine grace, believers become "conformed to the image of the Son." Thus by appeal to the Church's experience of the promised "baptism of the Spirit," Paul meets the charge that his doctrine of Justification "makes Christ a minister of sin."

The apostleship and gospel for the uncircumcision thus presupposes and builds upon the apostleship and gospel of the circumcision. Its validity depends upon the admissibility or inadmissibility of the inferences of Paul. Avowedly Paul universalizes what had previously been given only a national significance. But is it legitimate to do this? If we attempt to justify the reasoning of Paul, are we not involved thereby in the prior necessity of validating his assumptions, such as the divine inspiration of Isaian prophecy,

the propriety of Jesus' assumption of the rôle of the Servant, and its vindication by his resurrection?

We do not so act as regards the great thoughts of antiquity in other fields. We differentiate between the mode in which a truth may be arrived at and the truth itself. We learn from the philosophers and poets without adopting the dress and form of their ideas. We can find a philosophic insight into true principles of the social order in Plato's "Republic" without adopting Plato's ideal of the family, and without denying that his conceptions were arrived at oftentimes under mistaken assumptions. Surely the same liberty of historical interpretation is open to the Christian in dealing with New Testament sources.

The essence of Paul's gospel is that the entire ministry of Jesus up to Calvary was a manifestation of "the love of God." Paul approaches the whole story of Jesus' career from the viewpoint of the Isaian figure of the Servant. The Servant was sent to proclaim peace from God. The Servant was anointed with the Spirit to effect the Reconciliation. The Servant's life was made "an offering for sin." This work of redemption was Jesus' own. In a true sense it could be said that he "gave himself for us"; but even this self-dedication of Jesus must also be understood as God's doing, for Jesus avowedly acted on God's behalf, and the prophecy said distinctly that *God* "made

his soul an offering for sin" (Is. 53:10). Therefore the cross is really a token of "reconciliation" set up by God. It is "his own" love which it "commends" to sinners.

To take the story of humanity and thus sum it up in terms of Isaian imagery as a history of redemption is to speak the language of Judaism. But it is hard to think of any other, limited as are all human languages and forms of thought, which would offer a better vehicle. Paul would not have been Paul if he had not thus approached the question. Peter would not have been Peter if he had not reached his religious faith on even more naïvely Jewish presuppositions. Jesus himself—let us say it with utmost reverence—would not have been that "minister of the circumcision" which Paul explicitly admits that he was if he, too, had not shaped his work and made his sacrifice with special reference to his own people. We must accept this limitation to a particular time, and a particular environment, as the indispensable condition of any historical, human manifestation of the divine Spirit of Love.

But under the leadership of Paul beyond all others Christianity insists on transcending the nationalistic point of view. It does not deny that the word Messiah, the Anointed, is primarily a Jewish term. It does not deny that it is creating a new sense for it when, under the Greek equivalent "Christ," it sub-

stitutes "the world" as the object of the Reconciliation. It only affirms its indisputable right to see the Infinite under the aspect of the finite, the eternal and absolute in its individual and limited manifestations. Take away these, and no contact at all remains.

The modern historian can form a less distorted view of the past history of the race than could Paul, with his crude division of humanity into Jew and Gentile, his notion of creation as covering a few thousands of years on a stage marked off by the visible horizon. It does not follow that Paul's insight into the truly dominant forces which go to determine history is inferior to the most modern. To Paul, the Apostolic Message was the revelation of a new aspect of the divine nature. He appreciates now God's *redemptive* love, his love to men "while yet sinners." Luke represents Paul as making the usual appeal of Stoic and Jewish teaching to prove divine benevolence. God's love for humanity is shown in "rain and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts 14:17; 17:25). It was almost a commonplace of the age. Nor need we disparage a mode of argument which Jesus himself has deigned to use (Lk. 12:22-34). Yet the kind of love which is thus evinced has little of individual bearing. Four-fifths of the rain falls idly back into the ocean whence it was drawn; and of the remainder, no small part goes to swell disastrous floods. The

real Paul has a different basis for his doctrine of the redeeming love of God. It is to be seen in human heroism and sacrifice. Mercy, pity, forgiveness, were far from unknown to the God whom Paul had worshiped as a Pharisee. But no Old Testament writing recognizes any divine factor in the heroism of the martyrs. Judaism lacked the concrete instance whereby its general hope and faith in the mercy of God might be supported against the growing sense of ill-desert and experience of "the wrath." The Pauline theology supplies this lack. Jesus himself had set the example of interpreting his whole career as the working of a present redeeming, saving, reviving "Spirit of God." When this point of view was taken, including its application to his death, Jewish faith and hope received a tangible and concrete demonstration of the love of God. This is Paul's contribution to Jewish theology: the work of God's Messiah is a work of redemptive love. We may therefore look upon redemptive love as the supreme quality in the divine nature.

Paul writes to his Corinthian converts, puffed up by their *gnosis,* "If any man thinketh that he 'knoweth' anything, he knoweth not yet as he ought to know; but if any man loveth God, the same is known by him." Paul's great unknown successor at Ephesus, confronted by a more formidable type of boastful *gnosis,* sums up the new revelation brought by Chris-

tianity beyond both Stoic and Jewish teaching. His words are an echo of Paul:

> Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that *loveth* is begotten of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God *is* love. Herein the love of God was *made manifest* in our case, that God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

The conception of "propitiation" is undoubtedly open to criticism. It should perhaps be regarded as obsolete, at least in the sense it bore to New Testament writers. According to Dr. Denney, "No man ever thought of offering sacrifice for the sake of the moral effect it was to produce on himself." The New Testament writers, nevertheless, come strangely close to a representation of this kind when they declare that "God sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." The reason has already been abundantly shown. They approach the story of Jesus, particularly the story of the cross, from the viewpoint of the Servant prophecies. Yes; Jesus "gave himself up" for us. Yes; he died "for our sins." But this was also the act of God "in" him. For, as Isaiah had said of the suffering Servant, "Jehovah laid on him the iniquity of us all." The sinner may trust a love of God which is thus "commended," even in the hour of death and the day of judgment. Jesus

intercedes in the presence of Jehovah for transgressors; yes, for the rebellious also. So Isaiah had said of the Servant. These are the scriptural figures through which the Apostles express and interpret their "gospel."

Is, then, vicarious suffering obsolete? Possibly, as an act affecting the divine attitude toward the sinner. Certainly *not* as a "manifestation of the love of God." Is intercession in heaven on the part of the sainted dead an obsolete idea? Possibly, in the sense attached to it in antiquity. Certainly *not* in the sense of "a moral trust in the immortality of love." Surely we may to this extent give discriminating endorsement to that common gospel of divine forgiveness which preceded Paul's.

The validity of Paul's universalizing adaptation of the Message lies not in his special mode of apprehension, nor in the figures imposed upon his mind by the necessities of his environment, but in the vital grasp of one essential religious truth: "The love of God which is *in* Christ Jesus our Lord." It is this which gives hope and assurance. It is this which brings life and immortality to light through the gospel. It is this which warrants it in claiming to bring a new revelation of the nature of God. The love which finds expression in the noblest human lives, which found supreme expression in the life that was laid down for the forgiveness of sins, is "of God." Human

nature and divine are inseparable here. The mystery is forever insoluble that we should work freely of ourselves, yet God also work in us, not only to do, but even to will. If we apply this to ourselves, shall we not apply it to Jesus also? Let us put it baldly in terms as redolent of modern physics as New Testament terms are full of anthropomorphism: The gospel presents God as an immanent force of the type known in personality.

This, then, is to Paul the Apostolic Message, this is his assurance of redemption resting in the cross, that the love there shown is not a human thing only, however sublime simply as an example of patriotic devotion to the loftiest ideals. It is a *divine* thing by origin and nature. The love of God, the love which was "made manifest in Christ," is the hope of humanity. This is the Message of the Reconciliation, how that God, in the person and work of Jesus the Christ, and through his agency, was reconciling the world unto himself, overcoming the enmity as human enmities are overcome; "for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us." Paul also thus preaches the forgiveness of sins, the disappearance of "the wrath." When the stripes and imprisonments which he gladly endures for the gospel's sake are completed by the pouring out of his blood as a libation on the sacrifice and offering of his converts' faith, Paul's own sacrifice does not stand apart, any more than the

self-devotion of Jesus stands apart from that of the noble army of martyrs which he captains in the mind of the author of Hebrews. Paul counts his own martyrdom as "filling up that which was lacking of the suffering of Christ." It is part of the price men pay, and are glad to pay, that they may be fellow-workers together with God. Without it they might be good servants, they could not be sons. For the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth. But sons give a free devotion in proportion as they see what the Father is doing, and are animated by his Spirit. In the cross, accordingly, as Paul reasons, human and divine love are met together. From this union, spring the righteousness and peace of the Atonement.

To give endorsement worth the giving to the Apostolic Message it must be reduced to its essential elements. Everything that is special and incidental must be stripped away. Whether it be Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, we must distinguish between their theology and their gospel. The particular forms and adaptations of the truth they saw to local and temporary conditions must be distinguished from the imperishable, divine reality by which their souls were justly kindled. Carried back to its ultimate simplicity, the Message of the gospel is not twofold, but one. Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, the witness of the "spiritual" Christ, the great representative of all who did not see and yet have believed, the one witness to whose own

words we can appeal with certainty of their truth and authenticity, is he who places us at this impregnable point of vantage. The story of Jesus, as regards what he did no less than what he said, but especially including his self-devotion on the cross, is to Paul a manifestation of the love of God. But can we endorse this? Is that human quality which transcends self-interest and makes men lay down their lives for ideals,—that quality whose supreme expression is martyrdom,—is this human quality really our highest revelation of God?

A sentry frozen on duty,
  A mother starved for her brood,
Socrates drinking the hemlock,
  And Jesus on the rood.
And millions that humble and nameless
  The straight, hard pathway trod;
Some call it consecration,
  And others call it—God.

It is this aspect of Paul's gospel which chiefly wins support from the theologian evangelist, that great successor of Paul at Ephesus to whom tradition has given the name of "John." To him the cross is the great appeal of divine love to men rather than the great appeal of human love to God. Then as now it was already apparent that if all men were to be drawn to this Redeemer, it could not be by his mere teaching. It could only be by this "lifting up." To John as to Paul the cross is a spectacle by means of which

God manifests his love toward a lost race. It is compared to the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness as a token of forgiveness to all who have faith.

No words need be wasted to prove that the efficacy of the gospel with men is really here. To ask the question whether in the world's esteem the suffering of Jesus has added weight to his message is to answer it. In human estimation, love has little meaning if expressed merely in word or sentiment. To have meaning and value it must pay a price, and the depth of meaning is measured by the cost. In Johannine language:

> Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him? Little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and truth.

What then shall we say to the primitive conception which regards the suffering of Jesus as adding weight to his appeal *to God?* Surely we can but admit the charge that the conceptions of New Testament writers which speak of the "propitiation" of God's "wrath" by this martyrdom are "crude anthropomorphisms." He that looketh not upon the outward man, but upon the heart, has no need of man's standard of measurement. His judgment is not "overruled by an appeal

to a physical sense of pity." Let us freely admit that the language is figurative. But where is the language that is not figurative?

The anthropomorphisms and the crudities must indeed pass; but not until a full equivalent has been found for the permanent truths they were framed to convey. A personal relation between God and humanity involves a difference of attitude on God's part according as human conduct meets his approval or disapproval. Anciently men looked upon the wretchedness of the world as showing the "wrath" of God, just as, conversely, they took prosperity to be a proof of his "favor." We prefer milder terms, such as the "pleasure" or "displeasure" of God. But so long as the relation is conceived at all in terms of personality, it is not enough to discard the antiquated term. Its ghost will remain to haunt us so long as an element of truth continues unexpressed. Prosperity and adversity have long since ceased to be our touchstones of divine pleasure or displeasure. But we have not ceased to think of human conduct and character as pleasing or displeasing to God. Nor shall we cease to think of his "approval" or "disapproval" as making a world of difference, whatever the way in which this difference may appear, so long as we think of the relation between ourselves and God in terms of personality.

We may use parallel reasoning in relation to the

terms by which the New Testament writers speak of the "blood-atonement." It is quite true that suffering and sacrifice are gages of the depth of love for human judgment only. But the fact that divine judgment requires no such gage does not mean that it makes no discrimination. For us, the martyrdom of martyrdoms will be that of the cross till time shall end. It will be so not merely because of the nobility of the Sufferer, but because of his relation to the history of human redemption. To the Searcher of all hearts there may be countless martyrs and saints whose deeds of unrecorded heroism are well worthy to "make up that which was lacking of the sufferings of Christ." Fortunately, we may consider obsolete the medieval monstrosity of a quantitative theory of the suffering needful for the atonement. "Hereby," says John, "*we* know love." But he also bids us see it in God, and recognize that the interaction of divine and human love is redemptive.

Because we have ceased to think of self-devoting love as gaged by the amount of suffering undergone, we have not begun on this account to regard all love as of equal depth and value. Neither have we ceased to think that the quality revealed in the self-devotion of Christ is that which makes the difference of pleasure or displeasure in the relation of a personal God to his human creation. We have no standards by which to measure length and breadth and height, or

to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge. But until we have ceased to believe in a personal God, bowing down only to soulless mechanism as unresponsive as wood or stone, men will continue to believe that such love as Christ's makes a difference to God.

In the future as in the past, Christians will be free to form new theories of the Atonement. But their stability will be in proportion as they rest on this foundation of the love of God which was "in" Christ. We shall draw no line between the here and the hereafter. We shall attempt neither to isolate nor to measure the power of Christ's devotion. We shall leave behind us all that is truly outworn in the metaphors and figures of the past, "propitiation," "intercession," whatever survives of mere archaic form. We shall continue to take the cross as our symbol of divine and human love wrestling for the redemption of humanity; and in all time of weakness, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment we shall continue to put our trust in the immortality of love.

It remains for the theologian of to-day to take up the task where the historian and interpreter lays it down. There is a gospel behind Paul's theology to be interpreted again. His theology can teach us no greater lesson than to follow his example in placing an interpretation adequate for our own time on the story of the cross. In antiquity, the herald carried his message in symbolic form. His words might be

distorted or misunderstood, his action could not. So with Jesus' ambassadors of peace. The bread and wine which they bore with them among all nations were emblems of deeper meaning than the earth and water of the ancient herald, and their symbolism remains unchangeable. This is a gospel "from the Lord himself," which cannot be altered, but which every man translates as he is able. What it meant to the first disciples they themselves record in an answering ritual. They were baptized into the name of Jesus to express their trust in him as a living "Lord," by union with whom they secured peace with God. The meaning of the one symbol is as inexhaustible as that of the other. The symbol of the cup recalls perpetually the eternal mystery of love and pain. It was not fully solved by the great prophets and poets of the past. It was not fully solved for Israel even by the great prophet of the Reconciliation. It cannot be fully solved to-day. But to every generation since Calvary the witness of Jesus has been proclaimed, and will be as long as humanity endures. It is a witness of self-devoting love: "My body and blood are given for your sakes."

Will it be objected that this message was not meant for us individually, men of later generations and of far-off lands? Historically that is true. The symbol of the cup stands for a human act. It represents the

crowning act of devotion of a Jewish patriot for the national ideal. The love which it attests was a love of Jesus for "his own." But to be human at all, it must be so. Search where one will for any act of human sacrifice and devotion, it cannot but belong to some particular time and place. It must be humanly conditioned. Few indeed will those acts of devotion be found in which the martyr's life was given for an ideal more broadly human than this. But the sacrifice of Jesus was humanly conditioned, else it had not been human. Only, we have something here to learn from Paul and John. To know the infinite at all, we must see it in the finite. "Hereby know we love." If human love be not also divine, then have we no knowledge of divine love at all.

And this further token of water and the Spirit—is this also to be interpreted in terms of to-day? There would seem to be need of it; for where else can the message of the love of God find corroboration and support if not in the witness of the Spirit, testifying with our spirit that we are born of God? What is more vital to the perpetuation of Christianity from generation to generation than this ever-renewed response of individual souls to the appeal of the love of Christ? And what is so little understood?

The love of Christ constraineth us, says Paul, because we have come to this conviction, that one died

for all; therefore do all become sharers in his death. And he died for all that they that live might no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again. The baptism in which we of to-day become sharers in the self-devotion of Jesus, offering up our bodies likewise as instruments of righteousness to the God and Father whom he served, renews again our sense of the infinite mystery of man's free coöperation with God.

> Our wills are ours, we know not how,
> Our wills are ours to make them thine.

So to the world's end will all die with Christ who enter into the spirit of his devotion to the cause and kingdom of his Father. And so also to the world's end will they also be raised together with him, experiencing the gift of the Spirit that testifies with our spirit that we are born of God. The fact is here. The new life in the Spirit is something which we ourselves have seen and heard, though, like the winds of heaven, we know it only by its visible effects. Each individual, each successive generation of believers that finds redemptive impulse in the mind of Christ, in the indwelling power of the Spirit, adds its witness that the cross was not in vain. The message of faith and devotion from the Lord himself is a word of God that shall not return to him empty; and to it, every one that confesses Jesus as Lord affixes his seal that

God is true. The symbols are passed on from age to age. The interpretation of the message for every age and people in its own tongue is the task of those who seek to be ambassadors for Christ and God.

THE END.

DATE DUE

BT 265 .B ,492

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, 1860

The apostolic message

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BT265.B15 1925
Bacon, Benjam The apostolic message :
3 0645 0004 0942 1